1683
E H 63

THE

CASE

OF

Infant-Baptism.

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.
NEW YORK.

In Five QUESTIONS.

I. Whether Infants are uncapable of Baptism?
II. Whether Infants are excluded from Baptism by Christ?
III. Whether it is lawful to seperate from a Church, which appointeth Infants to be Baptised?
IV. Whether it be the Duty of Christian Parents to bring their Children unto Baptism?
V. Whether it is lawful to Communicate with Believers, who were Baptized in their Infancy?

By Dr Hickes. George Hickes DD.

LONDON,

Printed for *Tho. Basset*, at the *George* in *Fleet-street*; *Benj. Tooke*, at the *Ship* in St. *Pauls* Church-yard; and *F. Gardiner*, at the *White-Horse* in *Ludgate-street*, 1683.

THE

CASE

OF

THE CASE OF Infant-Baptism.

The Previous Discourse.

THE better to prepare the mind of my Reader for what I shall say in this Discourse about Infant-Baptism, I think it requisite to premise a short Introduction.

First, Concerning the Original, And

Secondly, Concerning the Nature of the *Jewish* Church.

Thirdly, Concerning the initiatory Sacrament into it, and the Persons that were capable of Initiation.

And Lastly, Concerning the alteration of it from the *Mosaic* into the *Christian Oeconomy*, or to express my self more plainly in the * Scripture-phrase, concerning the alteration of the House of *Moses* into the *House of Christ*.

* Heb. 2. 5, 6.

As for the Original of the *Jewish* Church, it is to be referred unto *Abraham* the || *Father of the Faithfull* purely considered as a Church. But if it be considered as a Common-wealth, or as a Church under such a Political Regulation, then it is to be referred unto *Moses*, who was called, even by Heathen Writers,

|| Rom. 4. 11.

* Dionyſ. Longin. περὶ ὕψους. Sect. 7.

the * *Legiſlator* of the *Jews*. Theſe two Conſiderations of the *Jewiſh* Church, *purely as a Church*, and as a *Common-wealth*, or as a Church under ſuch a mixture with a Common-wealth ought heedfully to be diſtinguiſhed.

1. Becauſe there is ground for ſuch a diſtinction in the nature of the thing.

2. Becauſe this diſtinction is made by the Apoſtle, who was of the Seed of *Abraham*, an *Hebrew* of the *Hebrews*, and by conſequence very well qualified to underſtand the difference betwixt the *Jewiſh Oeconomy* as a Church, and as a Commonwealth.

Firſt I ſay, there is a Ground for ſuch a Diſtinction in the Nature of the thing, as is evident to any man, who is capable of conſidering the difference betwixt the Church-Chriſtian before, and after its Union with the Empire. Before its Union with the Empire, it ſubſiſted by it ſelf purely as a Church above 300 years, in a State of Perſecution, from Chriſt unto *Conſtantine* the Great; and juſt ſo the *Jewiſh* Church for above 400 years ſubſiſted by it ſelf in a State of Peregrination and Captivity from *Abraham* unto *Moſes*, who brought them out of *Egypt*, and gave them the Law.

But Secondly, As there is ground for this diſtinction in the nature of the thing, ſo is it in effect made by the Apoſtle *Gal.* 3. 17. *This I ſay, that the Covenant that was before confirmed of God* [with *Abraham*] *in Chriſt, the Law which was* 430 *years after cannot diſannull, that it ſhould make the Promiſe* [to *Abraham*] *of none Effect.* Here is a plain difference made between the Covenant or Promiſe which God made with *Abraham* and his Seed, when he ſeparated him from the World unto himſelf, and that *Political* one, which he afterwards made with the *Jews*, when he gave them

them the Law: And this difference is alſo obſerved, *Rom.* 4. 13. *The Promiſe, that he ſhould be the Heir of the World, was not given to* Abraham, *or to his Seed through the Law, but through the Righteouſneſs of Faith: For if they which are of the Law be Heirs, Faith is made void, and the Promiſe is of no effect.*

From theſe words, which diſtinguiſh ſo plainly between the Covenant which God made with *Abraham*, or the Promiſe, which he made unto him, and the *Law*, it is evident that the beginning of the *Jewiſh* Church purely conſidered, as a Church, is to be dated from the Covenant which God made with *Abraham*, and therefore in the ſecond place, the way to find out the nature of the *Abrahamical*, or pure *Jewiſh* Church, is to conſider the nature of the Covenant, or Promiſe upon which it was founded; and if we examine the Scriptures, we ſhall find, that it was an *Evangelical Covenant*: For ſubſtance the ſame with that which is ſince made betwixt God and us through Chriſt. This will appear upon a Review of thoſe Scriptures which teach us, *That Faith was the Condition of this* Abrahamical *Covenant; that it was made with* * Abraham, *as the Father of the faithful, and in him with all Believers, with his Spiritual, as well as Carnal Seed, proceeding from him by ſpiritual, as well as natural Generation; and that the Bleſſings or Promiſes of this Covenant belonged unto them upon the ſame Account of their Faith.*

* Fide autem ſtare juſtitiam, & illic eſſe vitam prædictum eſt apud Habbacuc. Juſtus autem ex fide vivet. Inde *Abraham* pater Gentium credidit. In Genſ. credidit *Abraham* Deo, & deputatum eſt ei ad juſtitiam. Item *Paulus* ad *Galatas*. *Abraham* credidit Deo & deputatum eſt ei ad juſtitiam. Cognoſcitis ergo qui ex fide ſunt hi ſunt filii *Abrahæ*, providens autem Scriptura quia ex fide, &c. *Cyprian* adverſ. *Judæos*. *Judæi* a Deo receſſiſſe —— ſucceſſiſſe vero in eorum locum chriſtianos fide dominum promerentes, & de omnibus Gentibus, ac toto orbe venientes. *Cyprian.* ad *Quirin. Teſtim.* L. 3.

To this purpose speaketh the Apostle in the Fourth Chapter of his Epistle to the *Romans*, from the 9th. to the 15th. Verse: Cometh then this Blessedness [*of Justification by Faith*] upon the Circumcision only, or upon the Uncircumcision also? For we say, that Faith was reckoned to *Abraham* for Righteousness; how was it then reckon'd? When he was in Circumcision, or in Uncircumcision? Not in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision; and he received the Sign of Circumcision a Seal of (*the Promises made to*) the Righteousness of Faith, which he had being yet uncircumcised that [*so believing before*] *Circumcision*] he might be the Father (*both*) of all them that believe, tho' they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also (*as his Children*) and the Father of Circumcision to them, who are not of the Circumcision only, but (*who*) also walk in the Steps of that Faith of our Father *Abraham*, which he had, being yet uncircumcised; for the Promise that he should be the Heir of the World (*in his Posterity*) was not to *Abraham*, or his Seed, through (*the Righteousness of*) the Law; but through the Righteousness (*which cometh*) of Faith: For if they [*only*] which are of the Law be Heirs, (*his*) Faith (*so much celebrated*) is made void, and the Promise made (*to it*) of no effect. So *Gal.* 3. from the 5*th.* to the 10*th.* Verse: He therefore that ministreth unto you the (*extraordinary Gifts of the*) Spirit, and worketh Miracles among you; doth he it by the works of the Law, or by the Faith, which you have heard preached, even as (*it is written of*) * *Abraham*, (*he*) believed God, and it was imputed unto him for Righteousness; know ye therefore, that they which

* Quoniam autem & in *Abraham* præfigurabatur fides nostra, & quoniam Patriarchæ nostræ fidei, & velut prophetæ fuit plenissimè Apostolus docuit in eâ Epistolâ, quæ est ad *Galatas* dicens, *Qui ergo tribuit vobis Spiritum et operatur virtutes in vobis*—— Irenæus Lib. 4. cap. 38.

are

are (*the Children*) of Faith, the same are the Children of *Abraham*; and God in the Scripture foreseeing that he would justifie the Heathen through Faith preached before the Gospel unto *Abraham*, saying, In thee shall all Nations be blessed. So then they which be (*the Children*) of Faith, are blessed with faithful *Abraham who is the Father of them that believe.* Afterwards in Verse 26. Now to *Abraham*, or his Seed, *or Race* were the Promises [*of God*] made: He, (*i. e.* God, or *Moses* his Pen-man) saith, Not to Seeds, *or Races*, as if there were divers of them; but to thy Seed, *i. e.* to one of thy Seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the (*Abrahamical*) Covenant that was before confirmed by God in Christ, the Law, which was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disanull, that it should make the Promise (*made unto* Abraham) of none effect.

From all these Texts put together, it is plain, that the *Abrahamical* Covenant, upon which the *Jewish* Church, as such, was founded, was of a Spiritual, Evangelical Nature, and perfectly verified and fulfilled in Jesus Christ, who was made of the Seed of *Abraham*, and in whom all the Families of the Earth are blessed, and whose Day *Abraham* himself saw, and rejoyced. It is farther evident from them, that this Covenant was made with *Abraham*, as the Father of Believers, and with his Posterity, not as proceeding from him by natural, but by spiritual Generation, as Heirs of his Faith, as is plain from *Rom.* 4. 16. Therefore (*the Promise*) is of Faith, that so also it might be by Grace; to the end the Promise might be sure to all the Seed (of *Abraham*) not to that only, which is of the Law; but to that also which is of the Faith of *Abraham*, who is the Father of us all, *both Jew and Gentile, that believe.* So Chap. 9. 6. *&c.* not as tho' the Word

Word or Promiſe of God to them had taken none effect: For they are not all (*the*) *Iſrael* which are deſcended of *Iſrael*; neither becauſe they are the Seed of *Abraham*, are they all Children (*of God's Covenant*) but ('tis ſaid) in *Iſaac* ſhall thy Seed be called; [*tho'* Abraham *had more Sons*] that is (*all*) they which are the Children of the Fleſh, theſe are not the Children of God; but the Children of the Promiſe (only as *Iſaac* was) are counted for the Seed.

Phil. 3. 3. Hence ſaith the Apoſtle in the name of the Chriſtians, we are the Circumciſion, which worſhip God in the Spirit, and have no Confidence in the Fleſh, and it is one God which ſhall juſtifie the Circumciſion by Faith, and the Uncircumciſion through Faith; and if ye be Chriſt's, then are ye *Abraham's* Seed, and Heirs, according to the Promiſe, *which God made unto* Abraham.

Furthermore, that this Covenant was Evangelical, and made with the Poſterity of *Abraham*, not as his natural, but as his Spiritual Off-ſpring, will appear in

* Acts 7. 8. the third place from the initiatory Sacrament into it, which was *Circumciſion*, or cutting off the Fore-ſkin of the Fleſh; as it is written, *You ſhall circumciſe the Fore-ſkin of your Fleſh, and it ſhall be a Sign of the Covenant betwixt me and you.* Hence the Covenant of which it was the Sign, is called by * St. *Stephen*, the Covenant of Circumciſion; and Circumciſion on the other hand is called by St. *Paul*, the Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith; Faith, or Faithful Obedience being the Condition of that Covenant which God required of the Children of *Abraham*, and which they promiſed to perform. It alſo ſignified the Circumciſion of the † Heart; as *Moſes* ſaid unto the People of *Iſrael*, *Circumciſe the Fore-ſkin of your Hearts*, Deut. 10. 16. and in *Deut.* 30. 6. *The Lord thy God will circumciſe*

† ἡ δὲ ἐντολὴ τῆς περιτομῆς—τύπος ἦν τῆς ἀληθινῆς περιτομῆς, ἣν περιετμήθημεν ἀπὸ τῆς πλάνης, διὰ στοιχείας, Justin. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 260. ἃ ταύτην τὴν κατὰ σάρκα παραλάβομεν περιτομὴν, ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴν, ἣν Ἐνὼχ, καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι, ἐφύλαξαν, ἡμεῖς, δὲ διὰ τὸ σαββάτος αὐτὴν —— ἐλάβομεν ibid. p. 261.

cumcise thine heart, and the hearts of thy Seed, that thou mayest love the Lord thy God with all thine Heart, and with all thy Soul, that thou mayest live. And agreeably unto this Spiritual Signification of Circumcision, St. *Paul* saith *Rom.*2.28. *He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly, neither is that Circumcision, which is outwardly in the Flesh, but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and Circumcision is that of the Heart, in the Spirit, and not in the Letter, whose Praise is not of Men, but of God.*

As to the Persons who were capable of initiation into the *Jewish* Church by this Sacrament, we have a very plain account at the institution of it in *Gen.* Chap. 27. *I will* (saith God unto *Abraham*) *establish my Covenant between Me, and thee, and thy Seed after thee for an Everlasting Covenant to be a God unto thee, and thy Seed after thee—— Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore thou and thy Seed after thee in their Generations; this is* [The Token of] *my Covenant, which ye shall keep between Me and you, and thy Seed after thee, every Male among you shall be Circumcised. And ye shall Circumcise the flesh of your Foreskin, and it shall be a Token of the Covenant betwixt me and you, and he that is eight days old shall be Circumcised among you, every Male in your Generations, he that is born in the House, or bought with Money of any Stranger, which is not of thy Seed, he that is born in thy House, and he that is bought with thy Money must needs be Circumcised, and my Covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting Covenant.*

From this account of Persons to be Circumcised, it is plain,

First, That *Gentiles* who were born of * Gentile Parents in *Abraham*'s House, or bought with his Money, as Servants then were, and *Blacks* are now among us, were to be initiated into the Covenant by Circumcision, from whence it appears, that the Spiritual Race

* *Exod.* 12. 48, 49.

Race of *Abraham* were the Children of the *Covenant*, and that when God promised to be a God to him, and his Seed after him, he meant the Children of his Faith. Hence in all Ages of the *Jewish* Church, if any *Gentiles* embraced the *Jewish* Faith and Religion, they were admitted into it by Circumcision, and thereupon reckoned among the Posterity of *Abraham*, and the peculiar People of God, although they were not the Children of *Abraham* according to the Flesh. There were great numbers of *Gentiles* thus converted to the *Jewish* Faith and *Religion*, and grafted like wild Branches into the Olive-Tree, in all the Ages of the *Jewish* Church. Not to mention particular Persons, we read that many of the *Medes* and *Persians* became *Jews* in the time of *Ashuarus*, *Ester* 8. 17. * Likewise, in the time of *David* and *Solomon*, vast numbers of the *neighbouring Countreys* embraced *Judaism*, and in the time of *Hyrcanus* the whole Nation of the *Idumæans* turned *Jews*, and lived in their own *Country* according to the *Jewish* Rites. This short *account* of the *Jewish* Proselytes may satisfie any *Man*, who is not perverted beyond cure, that the Church of the *Jews* was not founded upon, nor constituted by natural Generation, but by Spiritual Regeneration, as the Church Christian is, and that those, who were then related unto God, as Members of his Church were so, because they were the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, who then was and still is the Father of the Church, and Church Members, to whom he is related not in his Natural, but in his Religious Capacity, as he was a Believer, and the Father of all those that believe.

* *Seldin de jure* l. 2. c. 2.

But Secondly, It is manifest from this Scriptural account of persons to be Circumcised, that Circumcision was an *Ordinance of Latitude*, comprehending Persons of all Ages, and that Children, and Minors not yet arrived

arrived at years of Discretion, who were incapacitated, as to some ends of Circumcision, were notwithstanding to be solemnly initiated by it, as well as grown Men, who were capable of all. God was pleased to call them his; nay, they were his Property, as much as their Parents of whom they descended, he looked upon them as holy and separate, and as Candidates of the Covenant, and he thought them so well qualified for admission into it, that he would not have it put off beyond the eighth day.

He that is eight days old, or as it is in the Original, a Son of eight days, shall be circumcis'd among you. God was so far from excluding of them from Sacramental Initiation upon the account of *natural incapacity*, that he limited the time for the administration of it, beyond which he would not have it deferr'd. And accordingly the *Jews* ever did most religiously observe it, from the time of *Abraham* unto the time of *John* the *Baptist*, and Christ, who were both Circumcised the * eight day. Nay when any *Gentile* turned *Jew*, they immediately Circumcised his Children if he desired it; always understanding that Children were called and elected by God in their Parents. Thus saith God unto *Abraham*, *I will establish my Covenant between thee and me, and thy Seed after thee for an everlasting Covenant, to be a God unto thee, and thy Seed after thee.* *Luke 1. 59. 2. 21.

The great Goodness of God made him thus separate the Children with their Parents from the rest of the World, and look upon them as part of his chosen peculiar People, by which they became relatively Holy, and of a religious Consideration, and differed from the Children of Unbelievers, as much as their Parents did from the Unbelievers themselves. Since therefore God was pleased to be so gracious as to choose the

Children with their Parents, and look upon them as Holy upon their account, it is no wonder that he ſhould oblige them to dedicate, and devote them betimes unto him, by ſolemn initiation into his Church. I ſay, he called and elected them in their Parents, and with them ſeparated them unto himſelf from the World, and, agreeably to the nature of this Gracious Call, and ſeparation, he made it a ſufficient qualification for their actual admiſſion into the Church, by the initiating Ordinance, which the Children as Heathens were not capable off, becauſe they were not ſo called, and choſen, and ſeparated of God.

This was ground enough for their admiſſion into the Church, and for God to look upon them, as Believers, though they could not make open Profeſſion of their Faith, as *Abraham* did before he was Baptized, and it is certain, after the example of *Abraham*, all * adult Proſelytes did. But though *Abraham* profeſſed his Faith before he was Circumciſed, *Iſaac* the next Heir of the Promiſe was Circumciſed before he profeſſed, or could profeſs his Faith, becauſe if he lived he was as ſure to profeſs it by vertue of his Calling, and Election as any adult Proſelyte was to continue in the Profeſſion of his.

* *Selden de Synedr. l. 2. c. 3.*

In the mean time the Faith and Conſent of the Father, or, if the Child had none, of the Suſceptor or God-father, and of the *Congregation* under which he was Circumciſed, was believed of old by the *Jews* to be † imputed to the Child, as his own Faith and Conſent. They had very good Ground in the Scriptures for this Opinion, becauſe the Infidelity and Diſobedience of the Parents, in willfully neglecting, or deſpiſing Circumciſion, was imputed to the Children, who were eſteemed and puniſhed as Breakers of the Covenant, when they were not circumciſed,

1 *Macchab.* 2. 46.

† *Scid. de jure lib.* 2. *c.* 2. *de Synedr. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

cised, as it is written, *Every uncircumcised Male, whose Flesh of his Foreskin is not circumcised, that Soul shall be cut off from his People; he hath broken my Covenant*; and therefore if the Act of Parents in neglecting to bring their Children to Circumcision was reputed theirs, much more their Act in bringing them to it might well be reputed as their Act and Deed. Thus in *Numb.* 3. 28. we find the keeping of the Sanctuary imputed to the Males of the *Cohathites* of a month old and upwards, because their Fathers actually kept it, and they were to be trained up unto it; and in *Deut.* 29. 11, 12. the *little ones* are expressly said to enter into Covenant with God, because the Men of *Israel* did so; and thus also our Blessed Lord, who took upon him the Seed of *Abraham*, although he healed * grown Persons for their own Faith; yet he healed † Children upon the account of the Faith of their Parents; or others who besought him for them; as it were imputing it to them for their own Faith.

Cassand. de Baptism. Infant. p. 732.

* *Matth.* 9. 29.

† Mark 9. 23. Matth. 8. 13. John 4. 50.

Vide Cassand. de Baptismo Infant. p. 729. *Dr. Taylor of Baptizing Infants*, Great Exemplar. *Part* 1. *Sect.* 9.

Having now briefly discoursed of the Original, and Evangelical Nature of the *Jewish* Church, and the Initiatory Sacrament of it, and the persons that were initiated thereinto, I now proceed to make a few Observations upon the Alteration of it, from the *Mosaical* into the Christian *Oeconomy*; or from the Legal State of it under the Old Testament, into the Evangelical under the New.

For as it was the same for Substance under the Law that it was before it; so it still remains the same for Substance under the Gospel, that it was under the Law. The Foundation is the same, tho' the Superstructure and Fashion of the House be very different: For *Abra-*

ham is ſtill the Father of the Faithful; and we that believe under the Goſpel, are as much his Seed, and Children in God's prime Intention, and the true meaning of the Words, as thoſe that were Believers under the Law.

Hence it comes to paſs, that the Church-Chriſtian is called in the New Teſtament, the New and Supernal *Jeruſalem*; to let us know, that Chriſtianity is nothing but Spiritual *Judaiſm*, the ſame City new reformed, conſtituted upon a new Charter, bleſſed with more noble and ample Priviledges than formerly; and every way better built, and more Auguſt than it was. Thus in *Rev.* 3.12. *Unto him that overcometh* (ſaith the Son of Man) *I will write the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is New* Jeruſalem, *which is come down out of Heaven, from my God*, that is, I will acknowledge him that holds out to the end for a perſon truly godly, and for a true Member of the pure Catholick Chriſtian-Church, which is the Spiritual *Jeruſalem* deſcended from above. And ſo Chap. 21. 2. *I ſaw the Holy City New* Jeruſalem *coming down from God, down out of Heaven prepared as a* Bride, *adorned for her* Husband, meaning *Jeſus* Chriſt. So in *Galat.* 4. *Jeruſalem which is from above*, or the Supernal *Jeruſalem* is [a] free [City] which is the Mother of us all.

Hence alſo it comes to paſs, that St. *Peter* in his firſt General Epiſtle, calls the Chriſtians by thoſe proper Titles and Appellations which God gave unto the *Jews*, as unto his peculiar People, *viz.* a *choſen Generation, a Royal Prieſthood, an Holy Nation, a peculiar People*; which muſt needs imply, that the Chriſtian Church is fundamentally, and radically the ſame with the ancient Church of the *Jews*. Accordingly St. *Paul*, tho' he was the Doctor of the *Gentiles*, yet compa-

compared the calling of them to the engrafting of the wild Olive-Tree into the old Olive-Trees Stock. If ſome of the Branches (ſaith * he unto them) be bro- * Rom. 11.
ken off [*through Unbelief*] and thou being a wild Olive Branch, was grafted in amongſt them, and with them partakeſt of the Root and Fatneſs of the [*Ancient*] Olive-Tree, boaſt not againſt the Branches [*ſo cut off*] but if thou boaſt [*remember that*] thou beareſt not the Root, but the Root thee; and afterwards, If thou wert cut off from the Olive-Tree, which is wild by Nature, and wert grafted contrary to [*thy wild*] Nature into a good Olive-Tree, how much more ſhall theſe [*unbelieving Jews*] which be the natural Branches, be *re-grafted* into their own Olive-Tree? From this Compariſon it is plain, that the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Church are the ſame in the Root and Stock: And from this radical Argument that is betwixt them, it proceeds, that St. *John* in his Symbolical way of Writing in the *Apocalyps*, calls the Chriſtians *Jews*: *Behold I will make them of the Synagogue of Satan which ſay they are Jews but are not*, Rev. 3. 9. 2. 9. Indeed, as *Judaiſm* was nothing but myſtical Chriſtianity; ſo Chriſtianity is nothing but reformed *Judaiſm*, which made our Saviour, who was the Reformer of it, ſay unto the *Jews*, Think not that I am come to deſtroy the Law, and the Prophets; I am not come to deſtroy, but to perfect and fulfill. And unto his Diſciples, who under him were to be Maſter-Builders of his Houſe, he ſaid, That a Scribe, or Doctor rightly inſtructed unto the Kingdom of God, was like a Man that is an Houſholder, who bringeth out of his Store-houſe things both new and old. Thereby ſhewing, as *Irenæus* obſerves, L. 4. c. 21.
that he muſt be a very skilful Scribe in the Old Te- & 43.
ſtament, that was fit to make a Workman of the new. The old Teſtament and legall Oeconomy was to be

his

his Magazine, and Storehouſe, out of which he was to fetch many ſerviceable pieces for the new Building; and accordingly our Saviour, tho' in reforming the Houſe of *Moſes*, he was fain to pull it down, that it might be enlarged, yet both he that began the Reformation, and his Apoſtles, who finiſhed it, like Men that were Houſe-holders, uſed much of the Old Timber and Materials, and conformed it too, as much as they, could after the manner of the old. * They introduced as much of *Judaiſm* into the Chriſtian Religion, as the nature of the Reformation would well bear, and adhered as much as they could to the old, both in the Matter and Form of the new *Oeconomy*; and laid by few *Jewiſh* Rites and Cuſtoms, but ſuch as were fulfilled in Chriſt and Chriſtianity, as the Antitype and Subſtance of them; or elſe ſuch as were inconſiſtent with the Nature of the Church-Chriſtian, as it was to be a manly, free, and univerſal Church.

* Dr. *Hammond of Infant Baptiſm.*

Theſe were the two reaſons for which Chriſt and his Apoſtles ſo much altered the Face of the Church from what it was under the *Moſaical Oeconomy*, Firſt, becauſe very many of the *Jewiſh* Rites and Ceremonies were || fulfilled in Chriſt and Chriſtianity; and Secondly, becauſe many of them were inconſiſtent with the nature of a manly, free and univerſal Church, ſuch as Chriſt intended his ſhould be.

|| Ac primò ita his in rebus comparatur, ut antitypus in typi locum ſuccedat, eumque adeo loco moveat, ut ſimul atque antitypus adfit, nullus deinceps typo locus, nullus uſus reperiatur. *Outramus* de Sacrificii, Lib. 2. c. 16. p. 204.

Firſt, then, many of the Eccleſiaſtical rites, and uſages of the *Jews* were laid aſide, at the time of Reformation, becauſe they were fulfilled in Chriſt, as the Antytipe, and Subſtance of them, as is plain from the words of the Apoſtle, 2 *Coll.* 16. Let no man judge you in Meat, or in *drink*, or in reſpect of an *Holyday*, or of the new *Moons*, or

of

of the Sabbath days, which are a Shadow of things that are to come *to pass*; but the Body is Christ, that is to say, Let no man impose upon you the Doctrine of *Mosaical Abstinence*, or condemn you for eating and drinking things prohibited by the *Jewish* Religion, or for not observing their Feasts, New Moons and Sabbaths, which are but Types of Christianity; and therefore ought to be laid aside. The like he doth shew in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, concerning the Temple, Priesthood, Altar, Sacrifices, and the whole Temple-Service; as is plain from many Passages, whereof I shall recite some. The Priesthood being changed, there is made also of necessity a change in the Law, chap. 7. 22. The Holy Ghost, this *signifying* thereby, that the way into the holiest of all, was not yet made manifest, while, as the first Tabernacle was yet standing, which was but a *Figure* for the time then present, in which were offered both Gifts and Sacrifices; that could not make him that did the Service perfect [*and cleansed*] as pertaining to the Conscience, which stood, or consisted only in a certain use of Meats and Drinks, and divers Washings, and other carnal Ordinances imposed on them, [*as Types*] until the time of Reformation [*by Christ*] chap. 9. 8, 9, 10. So ver. 24. Christ [*with the Blood of his Sacrifice*] is not entred into the Holy Places made with Hands, which are the *Figures* of the true. And after all, ch. 10. 1. the Law having only a Shadow of the good things to come, and not the Solidity of the things themselves, can never with those [*numbratical*] Sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually make the Comers thereunto perfect.

It would make a Book of it self, to recite all the Types and Shadows of the Old Testament, which are

applied

applied to Christ and Christianity by the Writers under the New. Besides what occurs in the Apostles Writings, there is much to the same purpose in the Epistle of St. *Barnabas*, which is very ancient; the Dialogue of *Justin Martyr*, with *Trypho* the *Jew*; and the Fourth Book of *Irenæus*, who after insisting upon many typical things, and persons in the Old Testament, at last concludes in the 38*th*. Chapter, *Nihil enim vacuum, nihil sine signo*; that almost every thing in it was typical, and had a mystical Reference to something under the New.

But Secondly, as many of the Ecclesiastical Rites, and Usages of the *Jewish* Church were taken away, because they were fulfilled in Christ and Christianity, so many others were annulled, as being inconsistent with the nature of the Church-Christian, as it was to be a *manly*, *free*, and *universal* Church.

First, as it was to be a *manly* Church in opposition to the legal Pedagogy of the *Jews*, as St. *Paul* called it in saying, That *the Law was but a School-master to bring them unto Christ* [Gal. 3. 24.] and that the *Jews* were under it as Children are under Tutors, and Governours, until the time appointed by the Father, the Fulness of Time, when God sent forth his Son, [ch. 4. 1, 2, 3, 4.] Hither we may refer abundance of those Precepts which concerned their Washings, and Purifications, or their Abstinence from menstruous Women, and unclean Creatures, which God imposed upon them in that State of Minority, chiefly to lecture unto them moral Purity and Temperance: For they had childish Understandings, and were, like Children, to be instructed by Symbols, and Symbolical Lessons, as is plain from the Precept about their Phylacteries, *Numbers* 15. 38. *Speak unto the Children of Israel, and bid them that they make Fringes in the Borders of their Garments*

Garments throughout their Generations, and that they put upon the Fringes of their borders, a Ribband of Blue, and it shall be unto you for a Fringe, that you may look upon it, and remember all the Commandments of the Lord and do them, and that ye seek not after your own heart, and your own eyes, after which ye use to go a Whoring.

But Secondly, as many of their Rites and Ceremonies were annulled at the time of Reformation, because they were inconsistent with the manly nature of the Christian Religion, so others were annulled, because they were not consistent with the free nature of it, in opposition to the Servile nature of the Jewish Church, which is excellently set forth by the Apostle. *Gal.* 4. 22, *&c. Abraham* had two Sons, the one by a Bond-maid, the other by a Free-woman, but he that was born of the Bond-maid was born according to the Flesh, but he that was born of the Free-woman, was born [*by virtue of the*] Promise *which God made unto* Abraham: Which things are an Allegory, for these [*two Women*] are the two Covenants. The one the Covenant which was made on Mount *Sinai*, which gendreth to Bondage, and this was *Agar*. For this *Agar* is [*the figure of*] Mount *Sinai* in *Arabia*, and answereth to *Jerusalem* which now is, and is [*still*] in Bondage with her Children. But [Sarah *is the figure of the Spiritual*] Jerusalem, which is [*come with Christ from*] above, which is the Mother of us all.

Now this Ecclesiastical Bondage, and Servitude of the *Jews*, consisted in the vast number of their Religious Rites and Observances, which if a Man consider in retail as to the Days, Weeks, Months, and Years, which they were bound to observe; the multitude of Sacrifices of all sorts, which they were bound to offer; the frequent Washings and Purifications they were bound to undergo; the strict distinction they were to

make of clean from unclean Animals; the Rules and Ceremonies they were bound to observe at Births, Marriages, Burials, at Bed and Board, at Home and Abroad, in Sickness and in Health, nay, even in Plowing, Sowing, and Reaping, he shall find that they were left almost in nothing to their own Freedom and Discretion, but that the Observances, to which they were bound in almost all their Actions, took up half of their time.

Such a burdensom and grievous Economy was that under which the *Jews* lived, but yet how severe and slavish soever it was, it was suitable to the slavish temper of that People, upon whom God imposed all these Carnal Ordinances for the hardness of their hearts, and propension to Idolatry, as * *Justin Martyr* often observes in his Dialogue with the *Jew*.

* Διὰ τὸ Σκληροκάρδιον αὐτῶν, καὶ εὔχερες πρὸς εἴδω λολατρείαν.

They were apt to forget God, and therefore he loaded them with so many Divine Rites and Observations, that at all times and places and in every action, they might be put in mind of him, and this Ceremonial Yoke was so heavy upon them, that it was little less then intolerable, according to St. *Peter*, who said, *Why tempt ye God to put a Yoke upon the Neck of the Disciples, which neither we nor our Fathers were able to bear?* This he said in the Council at *Jerusalem*, against the believing Pharisees, who taught, that it was needful to Circumcise the *Gentile* Christians, and to command them to keep the *Mosaical* Law, not yet rightly understanding, or believing, that it was one end of Christ's coming to set them free from the *Mosaic* Observances, as the Apostles then declared, and as St. *Paul* afterwards instructed the *Galatians*, who were led away into this error, saying, *Stand fast therefore in the Liberty, wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the Yoke of Bondage.*

Hither

Hither therefore we are to refer the annulling not so much of any particular sort of *Jewish* Ceremonies as of the whole Mass of them, even the dissolution of the whole Ceremonial Law, of which the *Jews* were grown weary, and with which they had been for a long time heavy laden, when Christ called them to take his Yoke and Burden upon them, which was to be so easie, and light.

But then in the last place, as the obligatory force of all the *Jewish* Rites and Ceremonies were taken away, because they were inconsistent with the free nature of the Christian Church: So some more especially were annulled, as being inconsistent with the universality of it, as it was to be a Catholick Church.

Hither we may refer all those which were set up by God as* Mounds and Hedges to keep the *Jews* from mixing and conversing with their Idolatrous Neighbours, and their Idolatrous Neighbours from being too familiar and well acquainted with them. Such as these were those of not rounding the Corners of their Heads, and of not shaving of the Corners of their Beards, of not letting their Cattel gender with divers kinds, of not sowing their Fields with mingled Seed, nor their Vineyards with divers Seeds; of not Plowing with an Ox and an Ass together, and of not wearing a Garment Linnen and Woolen. God injoined them these, and other things in opposition to the neighbouring Idolatrous Nations, that there might be a mutual strangeness and hatred betwixt them, and that by these and other Ceremonial Singularities, they might be distinguished from the rest of the World. But then Christ coming to break down the middle wall of Partition betwixt the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and to abolish the Enmity of Ordinances that was betwixt them, that he might make Peace betwixt them, and reconcile them both into one

* *Mamonides more Nevoch. p. 3. c. 37.*

Body in the Croſs, it was requiſite to this end, that he ſhould aboliſh theſe, and all other diſtinguiſhing Characters betwixt them, which would have hindred the Progreſs of the Goſpel, had it been clogg'd with *Jewiſh* Rites and Ceremonies, which were become ſo odious, and ridiculous to all the Gentile World.

In particular, For this reaſon he was obliged to change the Initiatory Sacrament, and the Seal of the Covenant of Grace, I mean *Circumciſion*, by which the *Jews* (excepting a few* Nations) were diſtinguiſhed from all the World.

They were become ‖ odious and ridiculous to all other People upon the account of it, and for this reaſon it would have been a mighty bar to the Progreſs of the Goſpel, had the Gentiles been to be initiated thereby.

* *The ancient Egyptians, Ethiopians, Ismaelites, Cholchians.*

‖ Jura Verpe per Anchialum. Mart. Credat Judæus Apelles. Horat. Ferro luciderit inguinis oram. Petron. Mox & præputia ponunt. Juven. 1 Cor. 7. 18. *Is any Man called, being circumciſed, let him not be uncircumciſed.* i.e. *Let him not uſe means to attract the* Præputium, *which the* Jews *did often to avoid Shame, and Perſecution in Gentile Countreys.*

Furthermore, it alone was reckoned as a grievous burden by reaſon of the painful and bloody nature of it; and for that Reaſon alſo was laid aſide, as being inconſiſtent with the free and eaſy nature of the Chriſtian Religion; for if *Zipporah* was ſo much offended at *Moſes*, and called him a bloody Husband upon the account of it, we may well preſume how much the Gentiles would have been offended at the Apoſtles, and at their Doctrine, upon the account thereof.

No Religious Rite could be more ungrateful to Fleſh and Blood, and therefore the Wiſdom of our Lord is to be admired in changing of it into the eaſy and practicable Ceremony of Baptiſm; which was of more

more universal significancy, and which * *Pagans* (as Paganism was nothing but Judaism corrupted by the Devil) practised, as well as *Jews*.

* Diabolus ipsas quoqueres Sacramentorum divinorum idolorum mysteriis æmulatur, *tingit* & ipse quosdam, utique credentes, ac fideles suos ——cæterum si Numæ superstitiones revolvamus——nonne manifeste diabolus morositatem illam Judaicæ legis imitatus est? Tertull. de præscrip. hæret. c. 40. O timium faciles! Qui tristia crimina cædis tolli fluminea posse putatis aquâ.

Hitherto I have given the Reasons of altering the *Jewish Economy*, and of reforming of it into the Christian Church, but then my undertaking obliges me to prove what before I observed, that * Christ and his Apostles, who were the Reformers of it, did build with many of the old Materials, and conformed their new house, as much as they could, after the Platform of the old. This will appear from Baptism it self, which was a Ceremony by which || Proselytes both Men, Women, and Children were initiated into the *Jewish* Church. Though it were but a mere humane Institution, or, as the dissenting Parties usually phrase it, a mere humane invention; yet so much respect had our blessed Lord for the Antient Orders and Customes of the *Jewish* Church, that being obliged to lay by Circumcision for the reasons above mentioned, he consecrated this instead of it to be the Sacrament of initiation into his Church, and a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith. So likewise the other Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was certainly of * *Jewish* Original, as hath been shewed

* Verissimum enim est, quod vir doctissimus *Hugo Broughtonus* ad Danielem notavit. *Nullas à Christo institutas vitas novas*, &c. Grotii opusc. Tom. 3. p. 520. *See Dr. Hammond in his discourse of the Baptizing of Infants.*

|| *Seld. de jure l.* 2. *c.* 2. *de Synedr. l.* 1. *c.* 3. Lightfoot Horæ Hebraicæ, p. 42. Hammond on *Matth.* 3. *v.* 1. and of the Baptizing of Infants. *Jacob Altingius* dissert. Philologica Septima de Proselytis.

* Mede 1 book. disc. 51. b. 11. Christian Sacrifice. Grot. Opusc. Tom. 3. p. 510. Dr. *Cudworth* on the Lord's Supper. *Thorndike* of Religious Assembly. ch. 10. Dr. *Taylor's* great Exemplar p. 1. disc. of Baptism. Numb. 11.

ed

ed by many Learned Men, and the Correſpondence of the Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons, to the High-Prieſt, Prieſts and Levites, doth ſhew that the Subordination of the Chriſtian Hierarchy is taken from the *Jewiſh* Church, as St. *Jerome* obſerves in his Epiſtle to *Evagrius*. *Et ut ſciamus traditiones Apoſtolicas ſumptas de veteri Teſtamento, quod* Aaron, *& filii ejus, & Levitæ in templo fuerunt, hoc ſibi Epiſcopi, & Presbyteri & diaconi vendicent in Eccleſia. What the High-Prieſt, Prieſts, and Levites, were in the Temple, that the Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons, are in the Church according to Apoſtolical Conſtitution taken from the Old Teſtament.*

Hither alſo is to be referred that wonderful Correſpondence betwixt the Prieſt-hood and Altar of the *Jewiſh* and Chriſtian Church, as it is moſt excellently diſcourſed by the Learned, and Pious * Mr. *Dodwell.*

* In his Diſcourſe concerning the one Altar, and the one Prieſt-hood, *&c.*

To all which, I may add many other Inſtitutions, as that of || Excommunication, and of the ritual performance of Ordination, Confirmation, and Abſolution of Penitents by Impoſition of hands, all which are of *Jewiſh* Orignal.

|| Dr. *Taylor* his great Exemplar Diſcipline of Baptiſm. Numb. 11. *Lightfoot* on 1 Corinth. Chap. 5. Verſ. 5.

Likewiſe, the Obſervation of the antient Love-Feaſts before the Holy-Euchariſt, which for their extream inconvenience, were taken away by the * Churches authority; the uſe of Feſtivals and Faſts; the Inſtitution of the Lord's day, which is nothing but the Sabbath tranſlated. In a word, the manifold and almoſt entire Correſpondence of the Church in her publick Aſſemblies, and Worſhip with the *Synagogue*, as it is

* Concil. Sext. in Trull. c. 24.

is set forth by Mr. *Thorndike, in his book of Religious Assemblies*, even to the formal use of the Hebrew-word, * *Amen.* * 1 Cor. 14. 16.

Rom. 11. 36. Eph. 3. 21. Phil. 4. 20. 3 Tim. 1. 17. Hebr. 23. 27. 1 Pet. 4. 11. Rev. 1. 16. Rev. 1. 7. Just. Mart. Ap. 2. p. 97. Iren. l. 2. c. 10. Athan. Apol. ad const. Imper. p. 683.

Hitherto I have made a short Previous Discourse concerning many useful Particulars. As

First, Concerning the beginning, or Original of the *Jewish* Church.

Secondly, Concerning the Nature of it.

Thirdly, Concerning the initiatory Sacrament into it, and the Persons that were capable of Initiation.

And Lastly, Concerning the alteration of it from the Legal into the Evangelical Dispensation; wherein I have briefly shewed the true grounds of that blessed Reformation, and how tender Christ, and his Apostles were of Altering or rejecting, more then was necessary, or of receding more then was needful from the *Jewish* Church.

All these things I thought necessary to be discoursed [as *Præcognita*] to fit and prepare the Reader's mind to understand the State of the Controversy about Infant-Baptism, as it is proposed in these five Comprehensive Questions. 1. *Whether Infants are uncapable of Baptism?* 2. *Whether they are excluded from Baptism by Christ?* 3. *Whether it is lawful to seperate from a Church which appointeth Infants to be Baptized?* 4. *Whether it be the duty of Christian Parents to bring their Children unto Baptism?* 5. *Whether it is lawful to Communicate with believers, who were baptized in their Infancy?* The whole merit of the Controversy about Infant-Baptism, lies in these 5 Comprehensive Questions, and I shall presently proceed to the stating of them after I have

have ſhew'd, that Circumciſion was a Sacrament of equal *Significancy*, *Force*, and *Perfection* with Baptiſm, and that Baptiſm ſucceeded in the room of it, not as the *Antitype* ſucceeded in the place of the *Type*, but as one poſitive Inſtitution ſucceeds in the place of another, and this alſo is neceſſary to be foreknown by the Reader, becauſe the *Anabaptiſts* endeavour to ſhift off the force of many good Arguments, which otherwiſe are not to be evaded, by ſaying that Circumciſion under the Old Teſtament, was a Type of Baptiſm under the New.

Now to ſhew that Circumciſion was not a Type but only the Fore-runner of Baptiſm, we muſt note, that ſtrictly and properly ſpeaking, there was the ſame difference betwixt the Type and the Antitype, as betwixt the Shadow, and the Subſtance, or betwixt a Man and his Picture in a Glaſs; * inſomuch, that what was really, litterally, and properly in the Antitype, and of perfect Efficacy and Power, was generally, but Symbolically and repreſentatively in the Type, and figurative of ſomething, which did in a more noble, perfect, eminent, and efficacious manner belong to the Antitype, then it did to it.

* Deinde (quod maximè advertendum) id inter Antitypum & Typum intereſt, quod quæ *revera* in Antitypo vis in-eſt, ea non niſi ſpecie tenus, aut gradu longè exiliori in Typo exiterit. Enimvero quamvis Typus nonnunquam rem aliquam cum Antitypo ſuo communem habuerit, ea tamen res multò minùs in Typo, quàm in Antitypo ſemper valet ——— ita ut vis rei adumbrantis virtutis in ad umbratâ repertæ nil niſi Symbolica quædam Species, aut tam exilis gradus fuerit, ut pro umbrâ quadam haberi poſſit. *Outramus de Sacrif.* l. 2. c. 18.

Thus the blood of the Legal Sacrifices were but Shadows, and Repreſentations of the Blood of Chriſt, and the purging and cleanſing Virtue in their Blood, ſerving to the purifying of the Fleſh, was alſo but a faint and umbratical reſemblance of the more noble and efficacious cleanſing Virtue of his Blood which purges the Conſcience from dead works. So the Bra-

zen

zen Serpent was but a Shadow or Symbol of Christ upon the Cross, and the healing Virtue which belonged to it, was but a figure, or shadow of that more eminent, and powerfully healing Virtue, which was in Jesus Christ. But the case is not so betwixt Circumcision, and Baptism, because Circumcision hath no Symbolical likeness with Baptism, nor any thing belonging to it common with Baptism, which doth not as literally, properly, fully, and eminently belong unto it, as unto Baptism it self.

For First, Is Baptism a Sacrament of initiation into the Covenant of Grace under the Gospel? So was Circumcision before, and under the Law. Is Baptism now a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith? So was Circumcision then. Doth it properly, and effectually confirm and establish the Covenant betwixt God and us now? So did Circumcision then, as it is written, you shall Circumcise the Flesh of your Fore-skin, and it shall be a Token of the Covenant betwixt me and you. Baptism doth nothing under the Gospel, which Circumcision did not as properly, and effectually under the Law. This was then as absolute and real a Sacrament, as that now is. This did then as really initiate true Believers, as that now doth. It never was an Umbratical Sacrament, or shadow of another Sacrament, it never did Umbratically initiate Believers, or Umbratically, and in shew and Similitude only confirm the Covenant betwixt God, and the Seed of *Abraham*; and therefore could not be a Type of Baptism, no more then the Broad Seal of *England* 300 Years ago was a Type of this.

Accordingly it is never mentioned in the New-Testament as a Type of Baptism, nor Baptism, as the Antitype of it; but on the contrary, the only Typical Adumbrations which are found of it in the Gospel,

are such things, which have some Symbolical likeness with it, and were fitted upon that account to be Types thereof.

The First, is the Baptizing of the *Israelites* in the *Red-Sea. 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. Where the Red-Sea is a Type of the Water of Baptism, their passing through it, when they were delivered from *Pharoah* and his Host, a Type of our passing through that, and of our deliverance thereby from the Devil, and his Angels, and their Captain and Deliverer *Moses*, a Type of our *Saviour Christ*.

*Mare autem illud Sacramentum Baptismi fuisse declarat beatus Apostolus, Dicens nolo enim vos ignorare. ——— Et addidit, dicens hæc autem omnia figuræ nostræ sunt. *Cyprian.* Ep. 69. *Ed. Ox.*

The Second is the saving of *Noah* and his Family in the Ark, the like figure whereunto, saith the Apostle, even Baptism doth also save us ‖ 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. Here it is plain, that the Waters of the Flood were a shadow of the Waters of Baptism, the Ark a Type of the Church, and that the passing of the Ark through the Waters did prefigure our passing through the Waters of Baptism in the Ark of the Church.

‖ Item Petrus ipse quoque demonstrans, &c. *Cyprian.* Ep. 74. ad Pompeium contra Epist. *Stephani*, & in *Firmilian* Ep. contra eandem Epist. ad *Cyprian.* & in Ep. 69. Quod & *Petrus* ostendens unam Ecclesiam esse, &c.

But as for Circumcision it hath nothing in it Symbolical of Baptism, nor was it an Umbratical, but a real Consignation of the Covenant of Grace, every way as real, and substantial an Ordinance, as Baptism now is, and therefore succeeded in the room of it, not as the Antitype did in the place of the Type, but as one absolute Ordinance or positive Institution doth in the place of another, according to the Apostle, who saith unto

unto the *Colossians.*——*In whom also ye are Circumcised with the Circumcision made without hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh by the Circumcision of Christ, having been buried with him in Baptism.* Colos. 2. 11, 12.

But in the second place, if we consider the Original of Baptism, as a *Jewish* Institution, we shall find it very improbable, that Circumcision should be a Type of it, because a Type properly speaking is a * Symbol of something future, or an Exemplar appointed under the Old Testament to prefigure something under the New.

* *Typus*, quatenus vox ista sensum habet Thologicum, ita definiri posse videtur, ut sit futuri alicujus Symbolum quoddam, aut exemplum ita à Deo comparatum, ut ipsius plane Instituto futurum illud præfiguret. Quod autem ita præfiguratur illud *Antitypus* dici solet. Outramus de Sacrificiis. l. 1. cap. 18.

But, Baptism was it self of *Jewish* Institution under the Old Testament; and by consequence could not be Typified, and prefigured by Circumcision, with which it was coexistent, and used with it for many years together in the *Jewish* Church.

The *Jewish* Church made it a Ceremony of initiating Proselytes unto the Law, and our Saviour liking the Institution, continued the use of it, and made it the only Ceremony of Initiating Proselytes unto the Gospel, superadding unto it the compleat Nature of an Initiatory Sacrament, or the full force of Circumcision as it was a Sign of the Covenant, and a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith.

These things being premised, let us proceed to the stating of the former Questions. And first of all,

Quest. I. *Whether Infants are uncapable of Baptism?*

Which, considering what hath already been said concerning the Spiritual and Evangelical Nature of the Covenant, which God made with *Abraham*, and the initiation of young Children into it by God's especial appointment, cannot without rashness be affirmed. Nothing can reflect more dishonour upon the Wisdom of God, and the practise of the *Jewish* Church then to assert Infants to be uncapable of the same privilege, which God, and the *Jewish* Church granted unto them. For God commanded them to be Circumcised, and the *Jewish* Church commanded them to be Baptized, as well adult Proselytes, and if they were then capable both of Circumcision, and Baptism, surely they are capable of Baptism now.

If they be not, from whence comes the difference? Not from the Nature of the Covenants, for the Covenant, which God made with *Abraham*, and his Seed, was, as I have shew'd the same Covenant for substance, which he hath since renew'd with us in Christ. Nor from the Signs and Seals of the Covenant; for Circumcision was a Sign and Seal of the same Grace, or of the same Righteousness of Faith under the Old-Testament, that Baptism is now under the New.

Wherefore, since the Covenants were for substance the same, both Spiritual and Evangelical Covenants, and the Grace of those Covenants the very same, and only the Rites and Ceremonies which were Signs of those Covenants, and Seals of that Grace being different; what hinders in the nature of the thing, but that Infants who were capable of the one, should not also be capable of the other? Is Baptism a more Spiritual Ordinance then Circumcision? That cannot be, because Circumcision is a Gospel-Ordinance; I mean, an Ordinance of the Gospel which God *preached before unto* Abraham, and if the Spirituality of outward Ordinances

dinances are to be measured from the ends of their institution, then Circumcision was every way as Spiritual as Baptism, because it really signed the same Covenant, and sealed the same Grace, and was a Ceremony of Initiation to the same Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, that Baptism now is.

Wherefore, if the relative nature of Circumcision, considered as a Sacrament, was the same under the Law, that Baptism is under Gospel, it must needs follow, that Children under the Gospel, are as capable of this (supposing no new Command to exclude them) as under the Law, they were of that; if Infant Church-Membership, or the Initiation of Infants was then no absurdity, surely it can be none now: If God under the Old Testament vouchsafed it as a gracious Priviledge unto Children to be incorporated with actual Believers, and with them to be made Members of his Church; without a Prohibition to the contrary, they must needs be capable of the same Priviledge still. Nay, if Infants were admitted into the Church, when the entrance into it was more grievous, and not without blood, how unreasonable is it to assert, that they are now uncapable of admission into it, when the entrance into it is made more easy, and more agreeable to the natural weakness of a young and tender Child? Certainly if the *Jewish* Infants were Circumcised with the most painful and bloody Circumcision made with hands, Christian Infants, without a Special Countermand from God, must be deemed capable of the Circumcision made without hands, I mean of Baptism, which is the Circumcision of Christ. What God hath Sanctified, and Adopted, and made a Member of his Church, let no Man presume to think it uncapable of Sanctification, Adoption, and Church-Membership, but yet so rash and extravagant have the profess'd Ad-

verſaries of Infant-Baptiſm been, as to pronounce little Infants as uncapable of Baptiſm, as the young ones of unreaſonable Creatures, and that it is as vain to call upon God to ſend his Holy Spirit upon them, as to pray him to illuminate a Stone or a Tree.

Nay, upon this very Preſumption, that Infants are uncapable of Baptiſm, they aſſert Infant-Baptiſm to be a Scandalous abuſe of the Ordinance of Baptiſm, a meer Nullity and inſignificant performance, and ſcornfully call it *Baby-Baptiſm*, forgetting all this while that Circumciſion of Infants was no ſcandalous abuſe of the Ordinance of Circumciſion, but a valid and ſignificant Performance, and that in their Phraſe there was *Baby-Circumciſion*, and *Baby-Baptiſm* in the *Jewiſh* Church.

The reaſon why they conclude Infants uncapable of Baptiſm, is taken from the conſideration of their incapacity, as to ſome ends and uſes of Baptiſm, which cannot be anſwered (ſay they) but by the Baptiſm of grown Perſons, who are capable of underſtanding the Goſpel, and of profeſſing their Faith, and Repentance, and of ſubmitting unto Baptiſm, and of having their Faith and Hope further ſtrengthned in the uſe of it; but Infants being utterly incapable of underſtanding the Goſpel, or of profeſſing their Faith, and Repentance, and of ſubmitting unto Baptiſm in which they are meerly paſſive, or of having their Faith ſtrengthned in the uſe of it, they ought to be deemed uncapable of Baptiſm, whoſe ends are ſo much fruſtrated, when it is applyed unto them.

But this way of arguing how plauſible ſoever it may ſeem at firſt hearing, is weak and fallacious, and highly reflecting upon the Council, and Wiſdom of God.

First,

First, it is weak and fallacious, because it makes no distinction betwixt a *strict institution*, which is instituted by God for one, or a few ends, and precisely for Persons of one sort, and an *Institution of Latitude*, which is instituted by him for several ends, and for different sorts of Persons differently qualified for those several ends. Of the first sort, was the *Ordinance of Fringes* above mentioned, which could only concern grown Persons, because they only were capable of answering the end, for which it was instituted, *viz. To look upon them and remember the Commandments of the Lord*, and of the latter sort is the Holy-Ordinance of Marriage, which was appointed by God for several ends, and for Persons differently qualified, and capacitated for those several ends, insomuch, that Persons, who are incapacitated as to some ends of Marriage may yet honestly Marry, because they are capable of the rest. All the ends and uses, for which it was appointed can only be answered by the Marrying of Persons who are capacited for procreation of *Children*, notwithstanding superannuated Persons, who are past that capacity, are not incapable Subjects of Marriage, nor is the Marriage of such invalid, or an abuse of the Holy Ordinance of Marriage, because they are capable of answering one end, for which Marriage was ordained.

This shows how fallacious the Anabaptists argue against Baptizing of Infants, because of their incapacity as to some ends and uses for which Baptism was ordained; they ought first to have proved, what they take for granted, that it was a Divine Institution of the first sort, which I call a *strict Institution*, and then their Argument had been good, but this they will never be able to prove, because Baptism succeeded in the room of Circumcision, which was a Divine Institution of

the

the latter sort, and because our Saviour was Baptised, in whom there was a greater incapacity, as to the ends of Baptism, then possibly can be in *Infants*, even as he was in a greater incapacity as to answering the ends of Circumcision, then ordinary *Jewish Infants* were. *John* verily did Baptize with the Baptism of Repentance, and thereby sealed unto the People the Remission of their Sins, and therefore understanding very well that our Lord was not capable of this, and other ends of his Baptism, he forbad him, telling him, that he was fitter to be the Baptist, then to be Baptized of him; but yet as soon as our Lord gave him one general reason why he ought to be Baptized, *viz. Because it became him to fulfil all Righteousness*, he suffered him, which shews that Baptism is a Divine *Institution of Latitude*, and that in such *Institutions* the incapacity of a Person, as to some ends, doth not incapacitate him for it, when he is capable of the rest.

But Secondly, This way of arguing from the incapacity of *Infants*, as to some ends of Baptism is highly reflecting upon the Wisdom of God; who commanded young Babes to be Circumcised, although all the ends of Circumcision could not be answered, but by the Circumcision of adult Persons, who only were capable of understanding the nature of the *Institution*, and the nature of the *Covenant*, into which they were to enter, of professing their Faith and Repentance, and of submitting unto the bloody Sacrament, in wich Children were merely Passive, and of having their Faith and Hope further strengthned upon sealing unto them the Remission of their Sins.

Wherefore, the full force of this Objection rises up against *Infant-Circumcision*, as well as *Infant-Baptism*, because *Circumcision* was instituted for the same ends, that Baptism now is, and accordingly when Men were initi-

initiated by Circumcision they were to profess their Faith, and Repentance, and shortly after at their Baptism solemnly to renounce Idolatry, and all idolatrous Manners and Worship, and their idolatrous Kindred and Relations; and yet upon the desire of such Proselytes, their Children were initiated both by Circumcision, and Baptism, though they were altogether uncapable of understanding, or doing those things which their Fathers did.

Wherefore, those men who argue against *Infant-Baptism*, because it doth not answer all the ends of *Baptism*, reproach the Divine Wisdom, and the Wisdom of the *Jewish* Church, not considering, that Circumcision was, and Baptism is an Institution of *great Latitude* and compass, designed on purpose by God for Children, in whom there is a capacity for some, nay, for the *chief ends of Baptism, as well as for Men and Women, in whom there is a capacity for all.

*Rem Præcipuam in Baptismo non attendunt, hoc est testificationem divinæ benevolentiæ in fœdus & nexum suum suscipientis & gratiam conferentis, &c. nam in Baptismo præcipua res est divina gratia, quæ consistit in remissione peccatorum, regeneratione, adoptione, hæreditate Vitæ æternæ, cujus sane gratiæ Infantes & fatigantes & capaces sunt. *Cassand. de bapt. Infant.*

They are capable of all the ends of it, as it is instituted for a Sign from God towards us, to assure us of his Gracious favour, and to consign unto us the benefits of the Covenant of Grace. For their Child-hood doth not hinder, but that they may be made Members of the Church, as of a Family, Tribe, Colledge, or any other Society, nor doth it incapacitate them any more from being adopted the Children of God, then the Children of any other Person, nor of becoming Heirs of Eternal Life by virtue of that Adoption, then by virtue of any other Civil-Adoption, the Heirs to such a Temporal Estate. For Children are capable of

all acts of Favour and Honour from God and Men, and of being instated in all the Privileges of any Society, though they cannot as yet perform the Duties of it, nor understand any thing thereof. Since therefore, Children are as capable, and stand as much in need of almost all the Benefits of the Covenant of Grace, and the Privileges of Church Membership as Men, is it not as fit that the Confirmatory Sign of those *Benefits* and *Privileges* should be applied unto them as well as unto these? should a Prince Adopt a *Beggar's* Child, and incorporate him into the Royal Family, and settle a part of his Dominions upon him, and to solemnize and confirm all this, should cut off a bit of his Flesh, or command him to be washed with Water, who would count this an insignificant Solemnity, or say, that the *Child* was not capable of the Sign, when he was capable of the chief Things signified thereby? or to make a Comparison, which hath a nearer semblance with *the Case of Infant-Baptism.* Suppose a Prince should send for an attainted Traytor's *Child*, and in the Presence of several Persons assembled for that purpose, should say, *You know the Blood of this Child is attainted by his Fathers Treason, by Law he hath forfeited all Right to his Ancestors Estate, and Titles, and is quite undone, though he be not sensible of his wretched Condition. My Bowels of Compassion yern upon him, and here I restore him to his Blood and Inheritance, to which henceforward he shall have as much right, as if the Family had never been attainted. I justifie him freely, and declare my self reconciled unto him, and that no spot or imputation may hereafter stick upon him, I here before you all wash him with pure water, to signify that he is cleansed from his Original Attaindute and Corruption of Blood, and that he is as fully restored to his Birth-right, as if he had never been Attaint.*

Now

Now suppose this were done for a poor attainted Infant, could any Man say that the action was insignificant, and invalid, because the Child knew nothing of it, or that he was incapable of the Sign, when he was capable of being washed from the Attainture, and of being thereby restored to his blood, and Birth-right, which was the chief thing signified thereby?

These things should be well considered by the Despisers of *Infant-Baptism*, against whom I may urge for Precedents the Circumcision, and Baptism of the *Jewish* Church, both these, as I must often observe, were applyed unto Infants as well as adult, and actual Believers under the Old Testament, and accordingly, tho' *Abraham* believed, and solemnly professed his Faith before he was Circumcised, yet I hope they will not say that God acted foolishly, in commanding *Isaac, &c.* to be Circumcised before he understood the ends of Circumcision, or could believe, much less make profession of his Belief. He was entered Sacramentally into Covenant with God before he was able to re-contract, or understand what the condition of the Covenant was, but yet I presume they will not say he was Circumcised in vain, although he was under the very same incapacity as to the ends of Circumcision, that Infants are of Baptism now.

The best way, that I know, they have of evading the force of this Argument, is by saying, that Circumcision was more proper for Infants then Baptism, because it left a significant Mark, and Character in their Flesh, whereas Baptism is a transeunt Sign, and leaves no significant Impression behind it, whereby to instruct Men and Women what was done unto them in their Infancy. But this is a meer shift.

First, Because the Mark, and Character, which Circumcision left in the Flesh of the Child, was as insignificant to him during the time of his Non-age, as Baptism is to *Christian Infants*, neither afterwards could he tell, but by the instruction of others, what the meaning of that Character was, and for what ends it was imprinted in his Flesh. And therefore, according to their way of reasoning against *Infant-Baptism*, it ought to have been deferred till the full years of discretion, when the Circumcised Person might have understood the Spiritual Signification thereof.

Furthermore, in answer to this Objection, I must remind them, that the Mark and Character which Circumcision left behind it, was of no force, or signification, unless it did appear from the * Registers of the Tribes, that the Person circumcised was a *Jew*.

* *Ezrah* 2. 62. *Nehem.* 7. 5. 64.

I say, the *Character* which *Circumcision* left behind it, was merely of it self of no force nor signification without the Registers, or written *Genealogies*, because without them neither the circumcised Person himself, nor the *Church* could know in many *Circumstances* whether he were a true Son of *Abraham*, or an *Egyptian*, *Ismaelite*, or *Samaritan*, who were all *Circumcised* as well as the *Jews*. If *Baptism* then be a *Transient*, *Circumcision* was an *Equivocal* Sign, and therefore these pretended circumstantial Differences signify nothing, nor make any substantial difference betwixt *Circumcision* and *Baptism*, as to the capacity of *Infants* unto both. They are capable of contracting a Spiritual Relation unto God by this, as formerly they were by that; they are capable of having their Spiritual attaindure remov'd; they are capable of receiving the Blessings of the *Covenant*, tho' they cannot perform the duties of it, and God may solemnly bind himself unto them, tho' they cannot as yet personally bind themselves unto him.

But

But Secondly, Allowing that Circumcision was more proper for Infants, then Baptism, yet this differently is wholly avoided by referring the Practice of Infant-Baptism not only unto Infant-Circumcision, but unto the Original Practice of Infant-Baptism in the *Jewish Church*; which understood very well, that it was but a transient rite, and left no Character upon the person, who was initiated thereby. Those therefore who take upon them to argue against Infant-Baptism from this or any other pretended reason, take upon them to censure, and condemn the *Jewish* Church, which for many Ages Baptised Infants, and Minor Proselytes into the Covenant, as well as actual Believers, and yet were never censured, or reproved for it by any Prophet, which we may presume they would have been, had Baptismal Initiation of Infants into the Covenant been so absurd, insignificant, and abusive a practice, as the Professors against Infant-Baptism vainly pretend it is.

Having now, I hope, sufficiently proved, that Infants are not uncapable Subjects of Baptism. Let us proceed to state the next Question, which is this.

Quest. II. *Whether Infants are excluded from Baptism by Christ?*

Where, in the first place, I must observe, that this Question ought to be proposed in these Terms, and not *Whether Christ hath commanded Infants to be Baptized?* For as a good* Author observes of the River *Nile*, that we ought not to ask the reason, *Why Nile overflows so many days about the Summer-solstice?* But rather *Why it doth not overflow all the Year long?* So in the Controversy about Infant-Baptism, the enquiry ought not to be, whether Christ hath commanded Infants to be Baptised? But whether he hath excluded them from Baptism? Because, considering the practise of the

*Herodot. lib. 2.

Jewish

Jewish Church as to Infant-Circumcision and Infant-Baptism too, it must needs be granted, that a Command from Christ, to initiate Proselytes out of all Nations into the Christian Religion, must without an exception to the contrary, be understood to comprehend Infants, as well as Men.

As for Example, suppose our Saviour had not changed the Seal of the Covenant, but instead of *Baptizing*, had said unto the Apostles, *Go, and make all Nations my Disciples*, Circumcising *them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* I appeal to any Impartial Man's judgment, whether the Apostles receiving such a Commission to Circumcise Proselytes of all Nations, would not have presumed without directions to the contrary, that it was Christ's Intention that the Infants of adult Proselytes should be Circumcised as well as Proselytes themselves, according to the Commandment of God under the Old Testament, and the Practice of the *Jewish* Church.

Dr. *Stillingfleets* Vindication of the *A.C.p.*100.

And if a command to Proselyte and Circumcise all Nations would, without an exception, have comprehended Infants, as well as Men, why should it be imagined that the command to Proselyte and Baptize all Nations should not likewise comprehend them, seeing that Infant-Baptism, as well as Infant-Circumcision had been the immemorial Practice of the *Jewish* Church.

This is so true, that supposing our Saviour had intended the gathering of Churches among the Gentiles according to the Old Testament, and the Custom of the *Jewish* Church, he need not have expressed his meaning in any other manner, then by saying unto the Apostles; *Go Proselyte all Nations* Circumciling *and* Baptising *of them*, &c. Nay he could scarce have expressed his Intentions in a more emphatical or intelligible

telligible manner unto them, who being *Jews* must needs have the same Apprehensions as to the Subjects of Initiation, and Church-Membership under the Gospel, that they had under the Law. They had lived under a Dispensation, where Infants were initiated both by Circumcision and Baptism into the Church, and without they had been instructed to the contrary, they must naturally have understood their Commission of Baptizing to have extended unto Infants, as well as actual Believers; as if, for instance, God should now extraordinarily call twelve Men of any Christian Nation, where Infant-Baptism had been a constant and universal Practice, and bid them *go, and Proselyte the* Indians, *baptizing them*, &c. None of these Men could possibly imagine, that Infants were excepted out of their Commission; but common sense, on the contrary, would oblige them to understand it according to the usage of their own Church.

Besides, abstracting at present from the Controversy, Whether Christ did, or did not exclude Infants from Baptism? What reason can any Man give why he who fetched so many of his Institutions from *Jewish* usages, should exclude them from it, and recede in this Point from the *Jewish* Church.

They are every way as capable of the visible Signs of God's invisible favour, and of the Benefits of the *Abrahamical* Covenant under the New Testament, as they were under the Old; they are as fit Subjects of Baptism now, as they were of Circumcision and Baptism then, their Initiation into both Churches seems to be equally rational; Because, though the sign of the Covenant be altered, yet the Covenant still remains the same. In a word, there lay no Obligation upon our *Blessed Lord*, to lay aside the practice of Infant-Baptism, as being inconsistent either with the *Ends*,

or

or the *Manly*, or *Universal* nature of the *Christian Church.*

Thus much I have said to shew, why the Question betwixt us and the Dissenters upon the account of *Infant-Baptism* should be, *Whether Christ hath excluded Infants from Baptism?* And not *Whether he hath commanded Infants to be Baptized?* And certainly, the Premises being considered, there is far more reason to conclude, that Christ should have prohibited Infants from Baptism, if it had been his intention not to have them Baptized, then that he should have commanded them to be Baptized, if it had been his intention to continue the practice of Infant-Baptism. For he need not have commanded his Apostles to do that, which they would naturally have done of themselves without a prohibition, and that he did not prohibit them to Baptize Infants, is now the thing to be proved, in shewing, that he did not exclude Infants from Baptism.

For if he excluded them from Baptism, he either excluded them from it directly by an express prohibition not to Baptise them, or consequentially by so limiting, and determining the Subject of Baptism, as to make it unapplicable unto them.

That he never excluded them by any express prohibition the *Anabaptists* themselves do grant, because there is no such prohibition to be found in the New Testament, but then they pretend, that it was Christ's intention that grown Persons should be the only Subjects of Baptism, because the Gospel requires, that Persons to be Baptized should first be *Taught*, *Believe*, and *Repent.*

First, The Gospel requires, that they should be Taught, as in *Matth.* 28, 19. *Go and teach all Nations Baptizing them, &c.*

Secondly,

Secondly, That they should believe, as in *Mark* 16, 15. *Go ye into all the World, and Preach the Gospel to every Creature*, saying, *He that Believeth, and is Baptized shall be saved.*

Thirdly, Repentance, as in *Acts* 2. 38, *Repent, and be Baptized every one of you in the Name of* Jesus.

But now, say they, these three Qualifications before Baptism, can belong to none but grown Persons, to Men and Women, at years of discretion, and therefore none but such ought to be Baptized. And accordingly, we find that Baptism was practised upon these terms throughout the History of the *Acts*, and in *Hebr.* 6. 1. 2. Repentance and Faith are mentioned as prerequisite qualifications to Baptism in these Words, *Not laying again the Foundation of Repentance from deadly works, and of Faith towards God, of the Doctrine of Baptismes.*

These are the Arguments, by which the Adversaries of Infant-Baptism endeavour to prove, that Christ so limited the subject of Baptism, as to exclude Infants from it. But in this they are grievously mistaken, because these, and the like Texts do of themselves no more prove, that grown persons are the only Subjects of Baptism, then the words of the Apostle 2 *Thess.* 3. 10. prove that grown Persons only are to eat. The Apostles words are these: *When we were with you this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat.* From whence in their sophistical way it may be argued thus.

It belongs only to grown Persons to eat, because the Apostle requires, that Persons who eat, should first Work; but now this Apostolical qualification of working can belong to none but grown Persons, and therefore none but such ought to eat.

I have made use of this Parallel instance to shew how inconclusive the former way of arguing against Infant-Baptism is in it self, and how impossible it is to prove from the Texts above-mentioned, or any other like them, that Baptism is restrained to grown Persons, because none but grown Persons can be Taught, Believe, and Repent. And I will further discover the weakness and fallacy of this Argument from a familiar Comparison, which any common Capacity may understand.

Suppose then there were a great Plague in any Country, and God should miraculously call eleven, or twelve Men, and Communicate unto them a certain Medicine against this Plague, and say unto them. *Go into such a Country, and call the People of it together, and teach them the Virtues of this Medicine, and assure them, that he that believeth, and taketh it from you shall Live, but he that believeth not, shall Dye.*

Upon this Supposition I demand of these Dissenters, if the words of such a Commission would be sufficient for the Missioners that received it, or any others to conclude, that it was God's intention, that they should administer his revealed Medicine to none, but grown Persons, *Because they only could be called together, and taught the Virtues of it, and believe or disbelieve them who brought it.* No certainly, this way of arguing would not be admitted by any rational Man, because the Children would be as capable of the Medicine, as the Men, though they were ignorant of the benefits of it, and merely passive in the Administration thereof.

Wherefore seeing Children, as I have shewed, are capable of the benefits of Baptism, and seeing the Apostles who received a Commission to go and Teach, and Baptize all Nations, Or, as it is in the words of St. *Mark*, to Preach the Gospel to every Creature, saying,

He

He that Believeth and is Baptized shall be saved. I say, seeing Children are capable of the benefits of Baptism, and the Apostles, who received this Commission, knew them to be capable of it, and to have had both Circumcision, and Baptism administred to them in the *Jewish* Church, how should they, or any others imagine from the tenure of such a Commission, which was given unto them, as Planters of Churches, but that it was Christ's intention that Children, as well as grown Persons were to be Baptized?

Should God in the days of *David*, or *Solomon*, have called eleven or twelve Prophets, and given them the same Commission, which [*Mutatis Mutandis*] Christ gave to his Apostles, bidding them go and teach all Nations the Law, Circumcising, and Baptizing of them in the name of the God of *Abraham*, and teaching them to do whatsoever he had commanded them, I say, should he have sent them out to preach the Law to every Creature, saying, *He that believeth, and is Circumcised, and baptized, shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned*, would a Commission so worded have been of it self a sufficient ground for them to think, that it was God's intention to restrain Circumcision and Baptism to adult Persons, contrary to the practise of the *Jewish* Church? Or, if in a short History of their Mission, and Undertaking, we should have read, that they Circumcised, and Baptized as many Proselytes, as gladly received their word, would this have been an Argument that they did not also Circumcise and Baptize the Infants of those believing Proselytes, according to the Laws, and Usages of their Mother Church? No certainly, such a Commission to Proselyte Strangers to the *Jewish* Religion, could not in reason have been strained to prejudice the customary right of Infants to Circumcision, and Baptism, and therefore in parity of

reason, neither could the Apostles so understand their Commission without other Notices, as to exclude Infants from Sacramental Initiation into the Church.

The plain truth is, their Commission was a direction how they should proselyte Strangers to Christianity, according to the nature of propagating a new Religion in strange Countreys, as it is set forth by the Apostle, Rom. 20. 14. *How then shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a Preacher? And how shall they Preach unless they be sent?* Accordingly they were sent out to Preach, or to Disciple Men, and Women by Preaching, and to Baptize as many of them, as should upon their Preaching Believe, and Repent. But though the Order of Nature required that they should proceed in this Method with grown Persons, as the *Jews* were wont to do with Proselytes to the Law, yet it did not hinder, that they who had been born, and bred *Jews*, should initiate the Infants of such Proselyted Persons, according to the usage of the *Jewish* Church. What need Christ have said more unto them, when he sent them out, then to bid them *Go, and teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the* Father, *&c.* Or, to *Preach the Gospel to every Creature*, and tell them, *that he that would believe the Gospel, and be Baptized, should be saved.* But then the respective sence of these words could only concern adult Persons, and their qualification for Baptism, but could in no reason be construed by them, to exclude Infants, but only unbelieving Men, and Women, whereof none were to be admitted into the Church by Baptism, before they were taught Christianity, and had confessed their Faith and Sins. Should God, as I said before, call twelve Men of any Church, where Infant-Baptism had been the constant and undoubted practice,

practice, and bid them go, and Preach the Gospel in the *Indies* to every creature, and to say, *He that believeth the Doctrine which we Preach, and is baptized with the baptism which we Administer, shall be Saved:* I appeal to any Dissenter upon the account of Infant-Baptism, whether he thinks that these Men, bred up to the practice of Infant-Baptism, could in probability so interpret this *Commission*, as to think, that it was God's intention, that they should exclude the Infants of believing Proselytes from Baptismal admission into the *Church*.

The Professors against Infant-Baptism, put the greatest stress upon these words of our Saviour: *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be Saved:* But if they would well consider the next words, they would find, that Infants are not at all concerned in them, because it follows, *but he that believeth not shall be Damned.* The same want of Faith, which here excludes from Baptism, excludes also from Salvation, and therefore it cannot be understood of Infants, unless they will say with the *Original Anabaptists, that the same incapacity of believing which excludes them from Baptism, excludes them from Salvation too. Wherefore, it is plain, that the believing, and not believing in that Text, is only to be understood of such as are in capacity of hearing, and believing the Gospel; that is, of grown Persons, just as the words in *Joh.* 3. 36. *He that believeth on the Son of God hath Everlasting Life, and he that believeth not shall not see Life, but the Wrath of God abideth on him.*

* *The Perturbatians. vid.* Cassandri præfat. ad Duc. Jul. Cli. & præfat. adverſ. Anabaptiſtas.

Thus far have I proceeded to shew, how *inconclusively* and *absurdly* the *Anabaptists* go about to prove, that *Infants* ought to be excluded from Baptism from the fore-mentioned Texts, which speak of the order of, and their Qualifications for Baptism Proselyting *grown Persons*; and as little success have they

with

with some others, which they bring to shew how *unprofitable* Baptism is for Infants, as that in 1 *Pet.* 3.21. Where the Apostle tells us, that external Baptism *of putting away the filth of the Flesh*, of which Infants are only capable, signifies nothing, *but the answer of a good Conscience towards God*, of which, say they, Infants are altogether uncapable; to which the answer is very easy, that another Apostle tells us, that *external Circumcision* of which Infants were only capable, *profited nothing without keeping the Law*, which Infants could not keep, nay, that the *outward Circumcision*, of which Infants were only capable, *was nothing*, but that the *inward Circumcision of the heart, and in the spirit was the true Circumcision*, and yet *Infants* remaining *Infants* were utterly uncapable of that; so that their way of arguing from this and such like Texts, proves nothing, because it proves too much, and stretches the words of the Apostles unto undue consequences, beyond their just Meaning, which was only to let both *Jews* and Christians know, that there was no resting in external Circumcision, or Baptism, but not that their Infants were unprofitably Circumcised, and Baptized.

So weak, and unconcluding are all the Arguments, by which the *Anabaptists* endeavour from Scripture, to prove, that Christ hath limited the Subject of Baptism unto grown Persons; put them all together they do not amount to any tolerable degree of probability, much less unto a presumption, especially if they be put in the ballance against the early and universal practice of the Catholick Church. Had not the Church been always in possession of this practice, or could any time be shewed on this side the Apostles, when it began. Nay, could it be proved, that any one Church in the World did not Baptize Infants, or that any consider-

ſiderable number of Men otherwiſe Orthodox, did decline the Baptizing of them upon the ſame Principles, that theſe Men do now, then I ſhould ſuſpect that their Arguments are better then really they are, and that Infant-Baptiſm might poſſibly be a deviation from the rule of Chriſt. But ſince it is ſo univerſal, and ancient a practice, that no body knows when, or where it began, or how from not being it came to be the practice of the Church, ſince there was never any Church Antient or Modern, which did not practice it, it muſt argue a ſtrange partiality to think, that it could be any thing leſs, then an Apoſtolical Practice, and Tradition, or the Original uſe of Baptiſm in its full Latitude under the Goſpel, which it had under the Law. *Had the *Churches erred they would have varied* (ſaith *Tertullian*) *but what is one and the ſame amongſt them all, proceeds not from error but Tradition.* Or, as St. ‖ *Auguſtine* ſaith upon this Subject, That *which the Univerſal Church doth hold, and was never inſtituted by Councils, but was always retained in the Church, we moſt rightly believe to have deſcended from nothing leſs then Apoſtolical Tradition.*

* Ecquid verſimile eſt tot ac tantas in unam fidem erraverint? Nullus inter multos eventus unus eſt.

Extra variaſſe debuerat error doctrinæ Eccleſiarum. Quod autem apud multos unum invenitur, non eſt erratum, ſed traditum. Tertull. de præſcriptione Hæret. c. 28.

‖ De Baptiſmo contra Donat. l. 4. c. 24.

* *Menno*, one of the moſt learned of the *Anabaptiſts* about the time of the Reformation, was ſo preſſed with this way of arguing, that he acknowledged Infant-Baptiſm to be as old, as the time of the Apoſtles, but then he ſaid, it proceeded from falſe-Apoſtles, and falſe-Teachers in the Apoſtles times. But if it came firſt from falſe Apoſtles, and falſe-Teachers, in the time of the Apoſtles, how came it to paſs that we heard nothing of that Innovation in the Writings of the Apoſtles or of their Companions and Contemporaries, ſuch as

* Caſſand. adverſ. Anabapt. p. 675.

St.

St. *Clement*, St. *Ignatius*, St. *Polycarp*, &c? How came St. *John* who ſurvived unto the latter end of the firſt Century to paſs it over in ſilence, or how came the Spirit in the Revelations, which by his Pen reproved ſo many abuſes in the Churches, not to cenſure this? It is very ſtrange, that none of the Pen-men of the Holy-Ghoſt, nor none of their Aſſiſtants, and Companions ſhould animadvert upon ſo ſcandalous an abuſe of the Holy-Ordinance of Baptiſm, which in a ſhort time would fill the Church with ſham Chriſtians, and deſtroy the Eſſence thereof. In like manner, if it came in by falſe Teachers, in the next Age to the Apoſtles, how came it to paſs that none of the famous Saints and Martyrs, who flouriſhed then, oppoſed it as a dangerous Innovation, nor gave us any account thereof? They wrote againſt the Hereſies of *Simon*, *Menander*, *Saturnus*, *Corinthus*, *Ebion*, *Valentinus*, *Baſilides*, *Marcion*, &c. but we find nothing in them againſt Infant-Baptiſm, though we are ſure from * *Irenæus*, and ‖ *Tertullian*, that it was practiſed in that Age.

* Omnes enim venit [Chriſtus] per ſemet ipſum ſalvare, omnes, inquam, qui per eum *renaſcuntur* ad deum, Infantes, & parvulos, & pueros, & juvenes, & Seniores. *i. e. Chriſt came to ſave all by himſelf, all, I ſay, who by him are born again to God, Infants, and little Ones, and Boys, and Young and Old.* In the Ancient Writers Baptiſm is called *Regeneration*, and Baptized Perſons are ſaid to be Regenerate, or *born again*, according to the Scripture, which calls it Λυτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας the waſhing of Regeneration, *Tit.* 3. 5. Hence ſaith Juſt. Mart. Apol. 2. Ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀυτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται. So hath *Phavorinus* obſerved, παλιγγενεσία τὸ ἅγιον Βάπτισμα λέγεται, *Holy Baptiſm is* called *Regeneration*, and thoſe who would ſee more proofs of it, may conſult *Suicerus* in the words Ἀναγέννησις and παλιγγενεσία. Dr. *Ham.* on *Matth.* 19. 28. *John* 3. 5. *Seldn de jure l.* 2. *c.* 4. But if after all this evidence any Anabaptiſt will ſay, that *renaſcuntur* in this place of *Irenæus*, doth not ſignifie *Baptized*, or *born again of water*, then it muſt ſignify *Regeneratid*, or *born again of the Spirit*; and if Infants, and little Ones can be born again of the Spirit, then they are capable of being *born again of water*, or of being Baptized, as *Voſſius* argues *diſp. de Baptiſmo.* p. 181.

‖ *De Baptiſmo.* Where what he ſpeaks about deferring the Baptiſm of Infants, ſhews that it was the practice of the Chriſtians in that Age. *Pro cujuſque perſonæ conditione, ac diſpoſitione etiam ætate, cunctatio Baptiſmi utilior eſt, præcipuè tamen circa parvulas. Quid enim neceſſe eſt, ſi non tam neceſſe, ſponſoris periculo ingeri?* ——— *Quid feſtinat innocens ætas ad*

ad remissam peccatorum. But this Opinion of his that it was more convenient to defer the Baptism of Infants, was his own singular opinion, as much as that was of deferring the Baptism of Virgins and Widows, till they were Married, which follows in the next words. *Non minùs de cunctis innupti procrastinandi*, &c. And he shews the same cause why he would have the Baptism of Children, and un-married Women deferred, for, fear they should be tempted to renounce Christ after Baptism. *Illi quidem timent ne negent, isti ne rursus ambiant, quem semel abnegarunt.* But then how absolutely necessary he thought Baptism for Infants in case of extream danger, is evident from other Passages, as Cap. 13. *Quum vero præscribitur omnino sine Baptismo competere salutem*, and Cap. 14. *Sufficiat solùm in necessariorum usuris, fructu, aut loci, aut temporis, aut personæ conditione impedito.* Tertullian confesseth sufficient reason, *quoniam rem vult perdidit hominis, si fortè statim præstare, quod sibi potuit.* So likewise in his Book *de anima*, Cap. 39. *Adeo nulla fermè Nativitas Munda est Ethnicorum — Alioquin Mundi erunt & omnino alienigenæ, nisi quia sancti ex aqua & Spiritu non fiunt in regnum Dei, v. g. Non erit Scintilla.* Ita omnis anima quia ex Adam contracta, nondum in Christo recenciatur, tam diu immunda, quam diu non renascitur.

Ignatius, *Polycarp*, *Papias*, who were all the ‖ Scholars of St. *John*, as likewise *Justin* Martyr, *Athenagoras*, and *Hegesippus*, were all contemporary with *Irenæus* who was * the Disciple of *Polycarp*, (and who as he tells us in several places of his Works, conversed with several Antient † *Presbyters*, that had lived in the Apostles times, of whom he had enquired after the Apostles Practises) and yet this inquisitive Father says nothing against Infant-Baptism though we are sure from him and his contempory *Tertullian*, that it was then of general practice in the Church.

‖ Act. Mart. Ignat.

* Ep. Irenæi ad Florinum. Advers. Hæres. Lib. 3. Chap. 3. Lib. 5. Chap. 33.

† Ad Florinum. Advers. Hæres. Lib. 2. Chap. 39.

What meaned all these Men to let such a pestilent practise pass uncondemned, which in a short time would leave none in the Church but *Mock Christians*, and so prevail against the Catholick Church, which our Lord promised the Gates of Hell should not prevail against? What, would not the Holy-Ghost preserve so much as one Church amongst so many, from such a dangerous error, but suffer them all to embrace

it without Opposition? * Would he suffer them all so soon to Apostatize, and to practise, and believe otherwise, then Christ had taught, and the Apostles preached. No! It is impossible, that they should all consent in such a dangerous error, or that they should all peaceably, and tamely submit to it without opposition, or that such an alteration should be made without Observation no body can tell how, or when.

* Nunc omnes Ecclesiæ erraverint, deceptus sit & Apostolus de Testimonio reddendo Nullam respexerit Spiritus Sanctus, uti eam in veritatem deduceret, ad hoc missus à Christo, ad hoc postulatus de patre, ut esset doctor veritatis. Neglexerit Officium dei billicus, Christi Vicarius, Sinens Ecclesias aliter interim intelligere, aliter credere, quam ipse per Apostolas prædicabat. Ecquid verisimile est tot ac tantæ in unam fidem erraverint. *Tertull.* de præscript. Hæreticoram. c. 28.

Wherefore these Dissenters are very unreasonable in charging the Church universal with *apostacy* from Christ upon the account of Infant-Baptism, and in striving to throw her out of the possession of such an ancient, and general practise merely by such indirect and consequential Arguments from the Scriptures, as the *Ancient Fathers* never drew from them, nor we can admit against their general practice and *consent*. Certainly those places of the * New Testament; which requires a *Profession* of Faith, *and Repentance*, in *grown Persons* before Baptism, were understood by the *Ancient Fathers*, they undoubtedly had well read and considered the History of Baptism in the Acts of the Apostles, but yet they never drew this absurd *Consequence* from them, that because *Faith, and Repentance* were to go before Baptism, which is an *Institution* of Latitude, in Adult *Persons*, that therefore Baptism was not to go before

* Neque verò ignota fuerunt Ecclesiæ, & priscis Ecclesiæ patribus Evangelicæ & Apostolicæ Scripturæ loca in quibus pænitentia, & fides unà cum Baptismo requiri videntur. Sciebant enim probe hæc ad adultos ——*Cassand. Præfat. Advers. Anabapt.*

Faith

Faith, and Repentance in Children and Minors, as both Circumcision, and Baptism in the like case were wont to go before them in the *Jewish* Church. They knew the difference betwixt the admission of actual and potential Believers, and also knew it was a very great inconsequence to argue from the Qualifications, which the Gospel requires in those, to the exclusion of these. I freely acknowledge to them, that no Arguments are equal to the Scriptures, when the *Interpretations* of them are not doubtful, yet when they are so, I appeal to any sober Dissenter of this, or any other perswasion, whether the harmonious practice of the ancient Churches, and the undivided consent of Apostolical Fathers be not the most sure and authentical Interpreters, that can be betwixt Men, and Men. They thought Infant-Baptism lawful, and valid, and no abuse of the Ordinance of Baptism, and let any modest and moderate Man judge, whether so many Famous * Saints and Martyrs, so neer the Apostles times, should fall into such a delusion, as to conspire in the practice of Mock Baptism, and of making so many Million of Mock-Christians, and Mock-Churches, or that a little Sect, which must have separated from all the Ancient, as well as Modern Churches, that were ever yet discovered, should be in a great, and grievous error themselves.

See Dr. Taylor of Baptizing Infants great Exemplar. Sect. 9. part 2.

*Hanc desipuere prædicta sæcula, ut tot millibus parvulorum per mille, & eo amplius annos *illusorium* Baptismæ tribuerent & à Christi temporibus usque ad vos, non veros ei Christianos, sed *Phantasticos* crearent? Siccine cæcatus est orbis terrarum, tantaque huc usque caligine involutus, ut ad aperiendos occulos suos, & ad tam diuturnam noctem illustrandam post tot patres Martyres, pontifices, & universarum Ecclesiarum principes vos tamdiu expectarit? *Petrus Abbas Cluniacens.* apud *Cassandr.*

Having now shew'd First, That Infants are not uncapable of Baptism.

Secondly, that they are not excluded from it by *Christ*; but that on the contrary, we have very convince-

ing Reasons to presume, that the Baptism of *Infants*, as well as of grown Persons, was intended by him. Let us now proceed to make a fair and impartial enquiry upon the Third Question.

Quest. III. *Whether it is lawful to seperate from a Church, which appointeth Infants to be Baptized?*

And this, considering what I have said upon the former Questions, must be determined in the Negative, *Whether we consider Infant-Baptism only as a thing lawful, and allowable*, or, *as a thing highly requisite, or necessary to be done.*

I know very well, that my Adversaries, in this Controversy, will be apt to deny this distinction betwixt *lawful* and *necessary*; as acknowledging nothing in Religious matters to be lawful, but what is necessary, according to that common Principle imbibed by all sorts of *Dissenters*, That *nothing is to be appointed in Religious matters, but what is commanded by some Precept, or directed unto by some special example in the Word of God.*

Hence they ordinarily say, Can you shew us any Precept or Example for Baptizing Infants in the New Testament, if you can, we will grant, that the appointment of it is lawful, but if you cannot, we disallow it as unlawful, nay as an *Usurpation*, and will never be of a Church, which so Usurpeth it over the *Consciences* of Men.

This way of arguing is plausible to the Vulgar, and would be very good, were there such a Principle in the Scripture, as this, from whence they argue, *viz.* That *nothing is to be appointed in Religious matters, but what is warranted by Precept, or Example in the Word of God.* Wherefore, as the Men with whom I have to deal in this Controversy, are generally Persons of good natural *Understandings*:

So

So in the First place, I beg them to consider, that there is no such Rule in the Scripture, as this, and therefore those, who teach it for a Scripture-rule, or Precept, do themselves impose upon Mens *Consciences*, as bad as *Papists*, and, like them and the *Pharisees* of old, teach the Traditions of Men for Doctrines of God. On the contrary, the Gospel tells us, that *Sin is the Transgression of a Law*, and *that where there is no Law, there is no Transgression*, and according to this plain, and intelligible Rule, though the Baptizing of *Infants* were not commanded in the Scriptures, yet the Church would have Power and Authority to appoint it, upon supposition that it is not forbid.

Secondly, I desire them to consider the absurdity of this pretended Scripture-rule, in that it takes away the distinction betwixt *barely lawful*, or allowable, and necessary, and leaves no Negative meane betwixt *necessary* and *sinful*, but makes things forbidden, and things not commanded to be the very same.

Thirdly, I desire them to consider, what a slavish Principle this is, and how *inconsistent* it is with the free, and manly nature of the *Christian Religion*, under which we should lie in a far more servile, and Childish condition, then the *Jews* were under the Law, which as it is evident from the Feast of Purim, and *from the Institution of Baptism among the* Jews, allowed private Persons to practice, and the Church to appoint things of a Religious nature, which God had not commanded to be done.

Lastly, I entreat them to consider, how utterly impracticable this pretended Principle is, as might be proved from the contrary practice of all those, who advance it against Ecclesiastical Authority, and particularly from their own practice, in Baptizing grown Persons, who were bred up from *Infants* in the *Christian Religion*,

Religion, and in admitting Women to the *Lords-Supper*, who were not admitted *to the Paſſeover, nor Paſchal-cup of Bleſſing*, without any Precept, or Precedent for ſo doing in the Word of God.

This little well conſidered, is enough to obviate all Objections againſt my firſt Aſſertion, *viz. That it is not lawful to ſeperate from a Church which appointeth Infants to be Baptized*, upon ſuppoſition, *that* Infant-Baptiſm *is barely lawful, and allowable*, but if any man deſire further ſatisfaction, as to this point, he may have it abundantly in *the caſe of indifferent things*, to which I refer him, it being more my buſineſs to ſhew here that *Infant-Baptiſm* is at leaſt, a lawful, and allowable thing.

To prove this, I need but deſire the Reader to reflect upon the State of the two firſt Queſtions: For if Infants be as capable of Baptiſm under the Goſpel, as they were of Circumciſion under the Law, and if Chriſt have not excluded them from it nether directly, nor conſequentially: Otherwiſe, if Baptiſm be an *Inſtitution* of as great Latitude in its ſelf, as *Circumciſion* its *Fore-runner* was, and Chriſt hath not determined the adminiſtration of it to one Age, more then one Sex: Once more, if Children may be taken into the *Covenant* of Grace, under the Goſpel, as well as under the Law, and Chriſt never ſaid, nor did any thing which can in reaſon be interpreted to forbid them to be taken in. In a Word, If they are capable of all the Ends of Baptiſm now, that they were of Circumciſion then, and of having the Privileges of Church-Membership, and the Bleſſings of the *Covenant* conſigned unto them, and Chriſt neither by himſelf, nor by his Apoſtles did forbid the Church to ſatisfy and fulfil this their capacity: Or laſt of all, If Chriſt hath only appointed Baptiſm inſtead of *Circumciſion*, but ſaid nothing to determine the Subject of it, then it muſt needs follow, that

that *Infant-Baptism* must at least be lawful, and allowable, because it is an indifferent, and not a forbidden, or sinful thing. But upon this supposition, that it were left undetermined, and indifferent by Christ, it might like other indifferent things be lawfully appointed by any Church, from which it would be a Sin to seperate upon that account. For in this case, Churches might safely differ in their practice about *Infant-Baptism*, as they do now in the Ceremonies of Baptism; and those who lived in a Church which did practise it, ought no more to seperate from her for appointing of it, then those who lived in another Church, which did not practise it, ought to seperate from her, for not appointing thereof.

Thus much I have said, I hope with sufficient moderation, upon supposition, that all I have written upon former Questions, doth but satisfactorily prove, that *Infant-Baptism* is only lawful, and not highly requisite and necessary; but then if it be not only lawful, but highly requisite and necessary, so that it ought to be appointed, then it must needs be much more sinful to seperate from a Church, which appointeth *Infants* to be Baptized.

Now, as to the requisite necessity of *Infant-Baptism*, supposing that my Reader bears in memory, that I have said upon the last Question, (to make it appear with the highest degree of credibility, that Christ instituted Baptism for Infants, as well as grown Persons, and that the Apostles, and their Companions practised *Infant-Baptism*) I must here entreat him further to observe, that there is a two-fold necessity in matters of *Christian Faith* and practice, one which proceeds from plain dictates of natural reason, or from plain and *express words of the Gospel*, where the sence is so obvious and clear, that no sober Man can mistake it, or doubt

of

of it, and another which proceeds from *the general Scope and Tenor of the Gospel, or from doubtful places in it so, or so understood and interpreted by the unanimous voice, and practice of the antient* Catholick Church.

The first degree of necessity is founded on ostensive certainty, and demonstration, wherein there is no room left for Objection.

And the Second is founded upon violent presumption, where the Objections on one hand are insufficient to move, or at least to turn the Ballance, if put in the Scale against the other, which is weighed down [*Mole universatis Ecclesiæ*] with the authority of the Universal Church. And because this Rule, like others, is not so intelligible without an Example, I will add some *Instances* of things, which are necessary to be believed, and practised by every good Christian under both these Notions of necessity, that they may be better understood.

According to the First Notion of it, it is necessary to believe, that *Jesus Christ is the Messias, and the Son of God*, because it is delivered in express words of Scripture.

And according to the Second Notion of it, it is necessary to believe, that *he is of the same substance with the Father, and equal unto him*, and that there *are three distinct, and coequal Persons in the God-head, which are all but one God*, because these Doctrines, though they are not to be found in express words in the Gospel, yet they are to be collected from several places of it, which were always so interpreted by that antient Catholick Church.

Again, according to the First Notion of necessity, it is necessary for all Men to believe the Word of God, whether spoken or written, because natural reason teacheth us so to do.

And

And according to the Second Notion of it, it is necessary to believe the Books contained in the New Testament, to be the Word of God, and no other (how Divine, and Orthodox, and Antient soever they may be) because they, and they only have been received for such by the antient Catholick Church.

In like manner as to matter of practice, by the First sort of Necessity, it is necessary for *Christians* to assemble together to Worship God, because Reason, and Scripture plainly teach them so to do.

And by the Second sort it is necessary, that they should assemble themselves periodically to Worship God on every first day of the Week, because the Observation of the *Lords Day*, appears to be a Duty from several places of the New Testament, as they are interpreted to this sence by the universal Practice of the antient Catholick Church.

To proceed, according to the First Notion of Necessity, Church-Government is necessary, because it is enjoined by the Dictates of Common reason, and most expres places of Scripture.

And according to the Second Notion of it, it is necessary, that the Church should be governed by Bishops (where they can be had) distinct from, and Superiour to *Presbyters*, because this *Government* appears to be instituted by Christ from several Passages of the *New Testament*, as they are explained by the uniform practice of the Primitive Catholick Church.

Furthermore, according to the first sort of necessity, it is necessary to administer the *Lords Supper*, because our Saviour hath commanded it in expres words.

And according to the Second, which is also an *indispensable* degree of Necessity, it is *necessary* to *administer* it to *Women*, though they *never* were admitted to the Passeover, or Paschal *Posticenium*, which *answered*

unto it, because we can prove from some probable places of the New Testament, that they were admitted unto it, as those places are in equity to be interpreted by the universal practice of the Antient Primitive Church.

To conclude, according to the former Notion of Necessity, it is necessary to Baptize, because our Lord hath commanded it in expres words.

And according to the Second, It is in like manner necessary to Baptise Infants, because we can prove their Baptism from the Scope, and Tenor of the Gospel, and from many Passages of it, as they are interpreted according to the practice of the Antient Primitive Church.

First, From the Scope and Tenor of the Gospel, which it is reasonable to presume, would extend the Subject of Baptism, as far as the *Jewish* Church extended the Subject both of Circumcision, and Baptism.

And Secondly, from many Passages in the Gospel, whereof I shall recite some. *Except a Man be Born again of Water, and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* John 3. 5. *Suffer the little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of* God. Mark 10.14. *The three noted places, which inform us, that the Apostles baptized whole Households, as of* Stephanas 1 *Cor.* 1, 16. Lydia *Acts* 16.15. *and the* Jayler *Acts* 16.33. *The Unbelieving Husband is Sanctified by the* [*BELIEVING*] *Wife, and the Unbelieving Wife is Sanctified by the* [*BELIEVING*] *Husband*; else, were your Children [*Common, or*] Unclean, but now they are Holy, 1 *Corinth.* 7. 14. And were all Baptized unto *Moses* in the Cloud, and in the Sea. 1 *Corinth.* 10. 2.

The requisite necessity of Infant-Baptism, may be fairly concluded from these Texts.

For

For the First seems to make Purgation by Water, and the Spirit equally necessary for all: ἐαν μη τις, &c. Unless *one be born again*, &c.

* Alioquin meminerat dominica desiderii nisi quis nascatur ex Aquâ & Spiritu non introibit in Regnum Dei, id est, non erit Sanctus, ita omnis anima usque eo in Adam censetur, donec in Christo recensetur, tamdiu immunda, quamdiu recensetur. *Tertull. de Anim.* cap. 39, 40. Pro hoc & Ecclesia traditionem suscepit ab Apostolis etiam parvulis Baptismum dare. ——quia & illi in omnibus geminæ sordes peccati, quæ per aquam & spiritum ablui debuerant. *Orig.* in Ep. ad Rom. l. 5. & in *Luc. Hom.* 14. Propterea Baptizantur & parvuli, nisi enim quis renatus, &c. Omnes venit [Christus] per semetipsum salvare, omnes inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum Infantes parvulos & pueros, & juvenes, & seniores. *Ruffin.* l. 2. c. 39.

From the * Second, it is reasonable to conclude, that little Children are capable of *Proselytism*, or entring into the *Covenant* after the *Jewish* manner, when they are brought unto it by others.

* *Tertullian* de Bapt. ait quidem dominus, ut veniant dum adolescunt, veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur. This he saith by way of Objection, which shews, that this Text was in his time understood for Infant-Baptism, but then because it was his greatest Opinion, that Christianis Baptismi præcipuè circa parvulos *was* utilior, *he answers*, sinite dum adolescunt, veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur.

First, Because they are declared * capable of the Kingdom of God.

And Secondly, Because ‖ the Original words ἀνωθεν, γεν, are the same with παλιγγενεσια, from whence the Word *Proselyte* doth come.

* *Cassandr.* de Baptism. Infant. p. 730. ‖ Dr. *Ham.* of Infant-Baptism. Sect. 22. 28.

From the Third, it is reasonable to conclude, That they Baptized the Children upon the Conversion of the Parents, after the Custome of the *Jewish* Church.

† From the Fourth, it is reasonable to believe, That the Federal Holiness of Believers Children makes

† Tertull. de anima. c. 39. Hinc enim & Apostolus ex Sanctificato alterutro sexu Sanctos procreari ait, tam ex seminis prærogativa, quam ex institutionis disciplina. *Cæterum*, inquit, *immundi nascerentur*, quasi delictorum tantùm sanctitatis, & per hoc etiam Baptismi meritò volens fidelium filios, ut hujus spei pignora, Matrimoniis, quæ retinenda censuerat, patrocinaretur. Alioqui meminerat.——

them Candidates for Baptism, and gives them a right unto it.

And the Fifth makes it reasonable to conclude, from the Type to the Antitype, that if the *Jews* with their Children were umbratically Baptized unto *Moses* in the one, that Christians and their Infants should be really Baptized in the other.

To all which may be added * other Texts, which have been alledged by the Antients both ‖ before and after the *Pelagian* Controversy, to prove the Baptism of Infants necessary, to wash away their Original Sin, which makes them obnoxious to Eternal Death.

* *Rom.* 5. *Psal* 51. 5. *Rom.* 3, 23, 24. *Joh.* 3. 5, 6. 2 *Cor.* 15. 21, 22. 2 *Cor.* 5. 14. 15. *Joh.* 14. 4. Vid Voss. hist. Pelag. lib. 2. part 2.

‖ Voss. hist. Pelag. p. 1. Thes. 6.

I say, the requisite necessity of *Infant-Baptism*, might be fairly concluded from these Texts, without the Tradition of the Antient Church, though without it I confess, it could not be demonstrated from them, as the Doctrines of the Trinity, and the Deity of the Holy Ghost may be fairly, and sufficiently proved from those Texts, which the Orthodox bring for them, without Antient Tradition, though without it, they could not be demonstrated from them, because they do not assert it in express words.

But then, as those Texts in Conjunction with Tradition, do put those Doctrines out of all reasonable doubt: So do the other, which I have cited in Conjunction with the practice of the Antient Church, put the requisite necessity of Infant-Baptism out of Question, because the Church in the next Age unto the Apostles practised Infant-Baptism, as an Apostolical Tradition, and by consequence, as an Institution of Christ.

In

In like manner, as the Intrinsecal Arguments taken from the Style, Sanctity, Dignity, and Efficacy of the Holy Scriptures, and the perpetual Analogy, and Conformity of the several Books contained in them, are by themselves but probable, and no demonstrative reasons, that all the Books contained in the Canon, and no other, are the Word of God, but in conjunction with the Testimony, and Authority of the Antient Catholick Church, amount to a Demonstration: So, though the Texts, which I have cited, are of themselves but probable Arguments for the requisite necessity of Infant-Baptism, yet in concurrence with such a Comment upon them, as the practice of the next Age unto the Apostles, and all Ages since, from one Generation to another, they amount to such a demonstration, as is called in *Logick*, *Demonstratio ducens ad absurdum*, and are a violent Presumption, that Children ought to be Baptized. I might run on the Parallel, as to the other Instances of Episcopal Government, the admitting of Women to the Communion, and the Observation of the Lord's day; and therefore let the Adversaries of Infant-Baptism consider well with themselves, Whether rejecting of it after a Concurrence of such Texts, and such a Tradition to establish it, they do not teach others, especially *Atheists*, pure *Deists*, and *Sabbatizers*; to which I may add *Sceptics*, *Socinians*, and *Quakers*, a way to deny all the rest.

Thus much I have said concerning the *requisite necessity* of Infant-Baptism, to shew that it is not lawful to seperate from a Church for appointing of Infants to be Baptized, when there are such cogent reasons arising from the concurrence of Scripture, and Antiquity to presume, that Infant-Baptism was an Apostolical Tradition, and an Institution of Christ. And I have designedly called it a *requisite*, to distinguish it from an

absolute

absolute necessity, lest the Reader should think, I were of St. *Augustin*'s Opinion, who thought Baptism indispensably necessary to the Salvation of Infants, so that a Child dying unbaptized, through the carelessness, or Superstition of the Parents, or through their mistaken Belief of the unlawfulness of Infant-Baptism, were * infallibly damned.

* Potest proinde rectè dici parvulos sine Baptismo de corpore exeuntes in damnatione omnium mitissima futuros. Multum autem fallit, & fallitur, qui eos in damnatione prædicat non futuros, dicente Apostolo Judicium ex uno delicto —— *Augustin.* de peccat. merit. & remiss. contra Pelag. l. 1. c. 16. Vid. & contra *Julianum* Pelag. l. 5. c. 8.

No, I intended no such severe Conclusion, (because we ought not to tye God to the same means, to which he hath tyed us) but only to shew that the Baptism of Young Children is antecedently necessary, and ‖ in any wise to be retained in the Church, as being most agreeable with the Holy Scripture, the Apostolical Practice, and the Institution of Christ. And to set this way of arguing more home upon the Consciences of those, who Dissent from the Church upon the account of Infant-Baptism, I appeal unto them, Whether Scripture, and Antiquity, standing against Infant-Baptism in the same posture of evidence, that they now stand for it, it would not be unjustifiable for any sort of Men to separate from the Church, for not Baptizing Infants, as they do now for Baptizing of them.

‖ Articles of Religion, *Artic.* 27.

Let us suppose, for Example, That the Disciples of Christ, instead of rebuking those, that brought little Children unto him, had brought them to him themselves; and he had been much displeased at them for it, and said, *I suffer not Little Children to come unto me, for the Kingdom of God is not of such*: Let us put the case, That two Evangelists had recorded this supposed Story, and

and accordingly we had been assured, by the Writers of the two next Ages to the Apostles, that then there was no Baptizing of Infants, and that the Apostles Baptized them not, and that there never was any Church in after Ages which did practice Infant-Baptism: Upon this supposition, I appeal unto them, Whether it would not be highly unreasonable to separate from all the Churches in the World, for not allowing of Infant-Baptism against the Concurrence of such a Text, to the contrary, and the sence and practice of the Catholick Church.

The case, which I suppose one way, is the real case the other, only with this difference, that the supposed case would have but the benefit of one Text, whereas the real hath the benefit of many in Conjunction with Tradition; and therefore, seeing there are so many Texts, and such a Cloud of Witnesses for Infant-Baptism, Why should it not be looked upon as one of the common Notions of Christianity, like the *Parallel Doctrines* above mentioned, though it be not commanded (especially when, as I have shewed there was no need of commanding of it) in express Words.

I know the *Dissenters* of all sorts, and especially those, for whose sake I am now writing, are bred up in great prejudice, and sinister Suspitions against Tradition, declaiming against it, as very uncertain, and against the use of it as very derogatory to the sufficiency of the Word of God. But as to the first part of their Objection against the certainty of Tradition, I desire them to take notice, that there is a certain, as well as an uncertain; an undoubted, as well as a doubted, a true, as well, as a pretended Tradition, as there are true, certain, and undoubted, as well as pretended, and uncertain Scriptures, and that there

are

are sure ways whereby ingenious, and inquisitive Men, may satisfie themselves, which is one, and which is the other.

The way then to find out true and undoubted Tradition, as * *Vincentius Lirinensis* teacheth, is to try it by these three Tests. *Universality*, *Antiquity*, and *Consent*.

* *Adverss. Haeres.* c. 3.

First by *Universality*, if all the Churches, wheresoever dispersed, or how different soever in their Languages, and Customs do believe, or practice such a Doctrine.

Secondly, *Antiquity*, If what all the Churches all the World over doth so believe or practise, was no innovation but Believed, and practised in the Ages next to the Apostles, when such Fathers governed the Churches, or such Famous Men lived in them, as knew the Apostles, and conversed with them, or lived near unto those, or with those Apostolical Men, who so knew them, or conversed with them, or lived near unto them.

Thirdly, *Consent*, If it appear that such a Doctrine was the consentient belief or practise of all the Fathers in those Ages, or of all except a very few, who had no proportion to the rest.

To which I will add, First, That this Tradition must be written, and not Orall. And

Secondly, that it must be proved in every Age from Books that were written in it, and whose Author, whether under their own, or under borrowed Name, had no interest to write so.

And therefore, though the Testimonies for Infant-Baptism in the *Constitutions*, going under the name

of

of *Clemens Romanus*, and the book of Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, bearing the name of ‖ *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, are of no authority as to the first Century, when St. *Clement*, and St. *Denis* lived; yet they are most excellent authorities for the third, and fourth Century, when they were written, because they had no interest to write for Infant-Baptism. The like, I may say, of the Testimony which the ‖‖ Ancient and Judicious *Author of the Answers to the Orthodox concerning some Questions*, gives of Infant-Baptism, it is of no authority as for the second Century, when *Justin Martyr*, whose name it bears, flourished, but being a disinterested writer, it is of excellent authority for the third, when it was written.

* L. 6. c. 19. Βαπτίζετε τὰ παιδία καὶ ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νουθεσίᾳ Κυρίου. —Baptize your Infants, and educate them in the Discipline, and Admonition of God, for saith our Lord, Suffer Little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not.

‖ C. 7. Where arguing for Infant-Baptism he saith, of this we say the same things, which our Divine Ministers of Holy things instructed by Divine Tradition brought down to us.

‖‖ Quæst. & respons. 56. Where he saith, that there is this difference betwixt Baptized, and unbaptized Infants, that Baptized Infants enjoy the good things of Baptism, which those, that are not Baptized do not enjoy, and that they enjoy them by the Faith of those, who offer them to Baptism.

So much for the *Test* whereby to try certain, and undoubted from uncertain and doubted Tradition, and happy had it been for the Church of God, if all Writers at the beginning of the Reformation, had made this distinction, and not written so, as many of them have done, against all Tradition without any discrimination; whereas Tradition, as I have here stated it, is not only an harmless thing, but in many cases very useful and necessary for the Church. It was by Tradition in this sence, that the Catholicks, or Orthodox defended themselves in the fourth Century against the *Arians*, and the Church of *Africk* against the *Donatists*, and the *Protestants* defend themselves, as to the Scripture-

Canon, and many other things against the Innovations of the *Papists*. And therefore, in answer to the Second part of their Objection against Tradition, as detracting from the Sufficiency of the Scriptures, I must remind them, that the Scriptures, whose sufficiency we admire, as well as they, cannot be proved to be the Word of God without Tradition, and that though they are sufficient, where they are understood to determine any Controverfy, yet to the right understanding, and interpretation of them in many points, Tradition is as requisite, as the * practice of the Courts is to understand the Books of the Law.

* Lex cum vit cum praxi.

This is so true, that the *Anabaptists* themselves cannot defend the Baptizing of such grown Persons, as were born, and bred in the Church merely from the Scriptures, in which the very Institution of Baptism hath a special regard unto Proselytes, who from *Judaism*, or *Gentilism*, would come over unto the Christian Faith. Accordingly they cannot produce one Precept, or Example for Baptizing of such as were born of Christian Parents in all the New Testament, but all the Baptized Persons we read of in it, were *Jews*, or *Gentiles*; and therefore they cannot defend themselves against the *Quakers*, [who for this, and other Reasons, have quite laid aside Baptism] without the Tradition, and Practice of the Church.

Quest. IV. *Whether it be a Duty incumbent upon Christian Parents, to bring their Children unto Baptism?*

To state this Question aright, I must proceed in the same order, that I did upon the last.

First, in arguing from the bare lawfulness, and allowableness of Infant-Baptism.

And Secondly, From the necessity thereof.

As-

As to the lawfulness of it, I have already shewn upon the last Question, That there is no necessity of having a Command, or Example for to justify the practice of Infant-Initiation; but it is sufficient, that it is not forbidden to make it lawful, and allowable under the Gospel. Nay, I have shewed upon the Second Question, that of the two, there is more reason that Christians should have had an express command to leave off, or lay down the practice of Infant-Initiation, because it was commanded by God in Infant-Circumcision, and approved by him in Infant-Baptism (which the *Jewish* Church added to Infant-Circumcision) under the Legal State. Commands are usually given for the beginning of the practice of something, which was never in practice before; but to justifie the continuation of an anciently instituted, or anciently received practice, it is sufficient, that the Power, which instituted, or approved it, do not countermand, or forbid it: and this, as I have shewn, being the case of Infants-Initiation, the Initiation of them by Baptism under the Gospel, must at least be lawful and allowable, and if it be so, then Parents, and Pro-parents are bound in Conscience to bring them unto Baptism in Obedience unto the Orders of the Church. For the Church is a Society of a People in Covenant with God, and in this Society, as in all others there are Superiors, and Inferiors, some that must order, and some that must observe Orders, some that must Command, and some that must Obey; and therefore, if the Catholick Church, or any Member of it commands her Children to observe any lawful thing, they are bound by the Common-Laws of all Government, and by the Precepts in the Gospel, which regard Ecclesiastical Order and Discipline, to observe her Commands. *Obey them* (saith the * Apostle) *who have the* * Heb. 13. 17.

Rule over you, and submit your selves unto them, for they watch for your Souls. Accordingly we read that St. Paul, as he went through the *Grecian* Cities delivered the Christians the Decrees, which the Apostles had made at *Jerusalem*, to keep; but I think, I need not spend more time in the Proof of a thing, which all *Dissenters* will grant me, for though they differ from us, as to the Subject of pure Ecclesiastical Power, yet they all agree, that there is such a Power, and that all lawful Commands proceeding from it, ought to be Obey'd.

* Act. 16. 4.

Wherefore, if Infants are not uncapable of Baptismal Initiation, as is proved under the first Question, nor excluded from it by Christ, as is proved under the Second; but on the contrary, there are very good Reasons to presume, that Christ at least allowed them the benefit and honour of Baptism, as well as grown Persons: then the Ordinance of any Church to Baptize them must needs lay an Obligation of Obedience upon the Consciences of Parents, and Pro-parents, who live within the Pale of it, because the matter of that Ordinance is a thing not forbidden, but at least, allowed by Jesus Christ.

But because People, when they are once satisfied with the lawfulness, are wont, especially in Church-matters, to enquire into the expediency of their Superiors Commands, and to obey them with most Chearfulness, and Satisfaction, when they know they have good reasons for what they ordain; therefore, least any one whom perhaps I may have convinced of the bare lawfulness of Infant-Baptism, should doubt of the expediency of it, and upon that account be less ready to comply, I will here proceed to justifie the practice of the Church in this Particular; by shewing

First,

First, That Baptismal-Initiation is very beneficial and profitable for Infants.

And Secondly, That the Baptizing of them conduceth very much to the well-being and edification of the Church.

First then, Baptismal-Initiation is very beneficial and profitable for Infants, because they are capable of the Benefits, and Priviledges of Baptism.

This I shewed in general before, under the first Question, and now I will shew it in a more particular manner of Induction, by insisting upon the several Ends, for which Baptism was ordained.

First then Baptism was ordained, That the Baptized Person might be thereby solemnly consecrated unto God, and dedicated to his Service, and I hope I need not prove, that Children are capable of this benefit; since *Jewish Infants* were Consecrated to God by Circumcision; and the Scripture tells us, that * *Sampson* was a *Nazarite* from the Womb, and that *Samuel* from the time of his Weaning, was dedicated unto the Lord.

* Judges 13. 15.

Secondly Baptism was ordained, That the Baptized Person might be made a Member of Christ's Mystical Body, which is the Holy Catholick Church. This is a great, and honourable Priviledge, and no Man can deny, but *Infants* are as capable of it under the New, as they were under the Old Testament. Nay, so far are they from being under any Natural Incapacity, as to Church-Membership, that they are ordinarily born free of Kingdoms, Cities, and Companies; and therefore, why any Man should think it not so proper for the Church-Christian to be as indulgent to them, as the *Jewish* Church was, and Civil Societies usually are, I profess I cannot tell.

Thirdly,

Thirdly it was ordained, That the Baptized Person might by that Solemnity pass from a State of Nature, wherein he was a Child of Wrath, into a State of Adoption or Grace, wherein he becomes a Child of God.

For by our First Birth we are all Children of Wrath.

But by our Second Birth in Baptism, we are made Children of God: And why it should be so improper for a Child to pass in this solemn manner from one Spiritual, as well, as from one Temporal State to another, or be Solemnly Adopted by God, as well as Man, or

Lastly, Why a Child may not be Adopted under the Gospel, as well, as under the Law? I am confident, those who are willing to defer the Baptism of Infants, would be puzzled to give any rational account.

In the Fourth place, Baptism was instituted for a Sign to Seal unto Baptized Persons the pardon of their Sins, and to confer upon them a Right of Inheritance unto Everlasting Life; but Baptism hath this effect upon Infants, as well as upon adult Persons, for it washes them clean from * Original, as it doth Men, and Women both from Actual and Original Sin. I say,

* De hoc etiam *David* dixisse credendus est illud, *qui in peccato concepit me mater mea*, pro hoc & Ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis Baptismum dare. Sciebant enim illi, quibus mysteriorum secreta commissa sunt divinorum, quia essent in omnibus genuinæ sordes peccati, quæ per aquam & spiritum abluí deberent. *Origen.* in Ep. ad Lous. *l.* 5. ἡ ἀρὰ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ κοινὴ πάντων ἐστί. Contra Celsum l. 4. Quanto magis prohiberi non debet Infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod secundum *Adam* carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiquæ primâ Nativitate contraxit. *Cyprian.* in Ep. ad *Fidum*: Those that would see more Testimonies out of the Ancients about Original Sin, before the time of the *Pelagian* Controversy, may consult *Irenæus* l. 4. cap. 5. l. 5. cap. 16. l. 3. cap. 20. l. 5. cap. 14. 17. 21. and many more cited out of *Just. Mart.* in Dial. cum *Tryph.* *Tatianus* his Scholar, *Athanasius*, &c. by *Vossius* in his Hist. Pelag. l. 2. part 1. Th. 6. *Vid. Can. Concil. Carthag.* 112.

it

it washes them clean from Original Sin, and seals the Pardon of it, and the assurance of God's favour unto them, and being cleansed by the washing of Regeneration from the guilt of that natural vitiosity which they derived from *Adam*, and which made them obnoxious to the displeasure of God, they become reconciled unto him, and acquire as certain a Right to Eternal Life, upon their justification, as any actual Believer in the Word. I cannot deny, but they may be saved without Baptism, by the extraordinary, and uncovenanted Mercies of God, and so may actual Believers, who die unbaptized, if they did not contemn Baptism; but then the hopes which we ought to have of Gods Mercy, in extraordinary Cases, ought not to make us less regardful of his sure, ordinary, and covenanted Mercies, and the appointed means, unto which they are annexed.

But in the Fifth place, Baptism was ordained, That being admitted into the Covenant, and ingrafted into Christ's Body, we might acquire a present Right unto all the Promises of the Gospel, and particularly unto the promises of the Spirit, which is so ready to assist Initiated Persons, that it will descend in its influences upon them at the time of their Initiation in such a manner, and measure, as they are capable thereof.

This the Primitive Christians found by experience to be so true, that they called Baptism, by the names of * *Illumination*, *Grace*, and *Unction*; and we need not doubt, but they talked, as they felt; and for this reason, they Baptized Infants, because they knew that they acquired a Right unto the same Spirit by Baptism, who would be sure to preside, and watch

* Hebr. 6. 4. Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν φώτισμος, Just. Mart. Apol. 2. 94. δῶρον καλοῦμεν, χάρισμα, Βάπτισμα, χρίσμα, φώτισμα. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. 40.

‖ Vid. Cypriani Ep. 1. ad Donatum.

over

over them, and act upon their Souls according to the measure of their capacity, and prevent them in their very first doings with his Gracious Helps.

Wherefore, though it should be granted, that the Holy-Ghost cannot be actually conferred upon Infants in Baptism, by reason of their natural incapacity (as *Anabaptists* rashly assert) yet the Baptizing of them is not frustraneous, as to this great End of Baptism, because they thereby acquire an actual Antecedent Right to the Assistances, and Illuminations of the Holy Spirit, which they shall receive, as soon, and as fast, as their natural incapacity removes.

This distinction betwixt having the Spirit, and having a Right unto the Spirit, holds not only in Infant-Baptism, but in the Baptism of Hypocrites, and Secret Sinners, who by submitting unto the Ordinance of Baptism acquire an actual Antecedent Right unto the Spirit, although they are in a moral incapacity of receiving the Graces of it, till their Hypocrisy is removed. Nevertheless, their Baptism is not ineffectual as to this End, but is a means of conferring the Holy-Ghost upon them without re-Baptization, because though they cannot receive it at the moment of their Baptism, by reason of their Hypocrisie, as sincere Penitents do, in whom there is no such Moral Impediment; yet by virtue of it, they will be sure to receive it afterwards, as soon, as they shall in any degree become capable thereof.

Those are the Blessings, and Benefits, consequent upon Baptism by God's appointment, of which Infants are as capable, as actual Believers, and let any Impartial Man judge, Whether it is more for their benefit, that this manifold capacity in them should be actually answered by the timely Administration of Baptism, or that it should lay void and unsatisfied, till they came

to

to years of Discretion? Which is best for a Child that hath the *Evil*, to be Touched for it, while he is a Child, or to wait till he is of sufficient Age to be sensible of the Benefit? Or to make one Comparison more, which would be best for a Traytors Child, to be presently restored to his Blood, and Estate, and his Princes Favour, or to be kept in a meer capacity of being restored till he was a Man?

But besides these Benefits which are consequent upon Baptism by God's appointment, there is another no less profitable to young Children, which will justifie the practice of *Infant-initiation*, and that is to have such an early pre-engagement laid upon them, which without the highest Baseness and Ingratitude, they cannot afterwards retract. No Person of common Ingenuity, who hath any sence of honour, or any tolerable degree of Conscience within him, can without shame and horrour break those Sacred Bonds asunder, by which he was bound to God, in his Infancy, when he comes to Years of understanding; but on the contrary, will think himself in Honour, and Gratitude, bound to own, and stand to the Obligation, which he then contracted, when he was graciously admitted to so many Blessings and Privileges, before he could do any thing himself towards the obtaining of them, or understand his own good. It would argue a Person to be of a very ill nature, and untoward Disposition to break such solemn Fœderal Vows, and therefore, we see that Children generally do readily take upon themselves their Baptismal Obligations, when they come to the use of reason, whereas were they left alone, to their own Freedom, when they would be Baptized, they would be apt to put it off from time to time, through the averseness that the corrupt nature of Man hath to such strict,

and Spiritual Engagements, and in such a State of Liberty, as this, Men would need, as many, and as earnest Exhortations unto Baptism, as unto the Lord's Supper; and in such an Age, as ours is at least, reluct as much to come unto that, as we see by experience they do unto this. Wherefore, upon Supposition that Christ doth but allow Children to be brought unto him in Baptism, The Wisdom of the Church is highly to be applauded for bringing them under such an early, and beneficial pre-engagement, and not leaving them to their own liberty at such years, when Flesh, and Blood, would be apt to find out so many Shifts, and Excuses, and make them regret to be Baptized.

And therefore in the Second place, as the Baptism of Infants is very Beneficial, and profitable unto them: So it conduceth very much to the well-being, and edification of the Church, in preventing those Scandalous and Shameful delays of Baptism, which grown Persons otherwise would be apt to make, putting of it off till the time of some great sickness, as many were wont to do in the third and fourth Century, when being not Baptized in their Infancy, they did ordinarily receive Baptism, as *Papists* now receive extream *Unction*, when they were ready to expire.

For, as it is usual now for Persons to defer the receiving of the Lord's Supper, for fear of Damnation, mistaking the Apostle, where he saith, *He that Eateth and Drinketh unworthily, Eateth, and Drinketh Damnation to himself:* So in those ages it was usual for Persons to defer their own, and their Childrens Baptism out of a * kind of Novatian Principle, for fear

*Dr. Caves *Prim. Christian.* part 1. ch. 10. ἀλλὰ φοβεῖ διαβεβαίης τὸ χάρισμα.—Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 40. p. 647. & 649. Sed mundus rursus delinquit, quò magis comperetur diluvio, itaque igni destinatur; sicut & homo, qui post Baptismum delicta restaurat. *Tertull.* de Baptismo. Ἀλλὰ δ' ἴδοικα φησὶ τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν εἰς ἁμαρτίαν ἔυκολον καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πρὸς τὴν χάριν παλιγγενεσίας βραδύνω. Greg. Nyssen de Baptismo.

that

that if they fell into Sin after Baptism there would be no place for Repentance, mistaking that place of the Apostle, where 'tis said, that *if they, who were once enlightned* [i.e. Baptized] *fall away, it is impossible to renew them again unto Repentance.*

Now the Baptizing of Children being deferred by their Parents out of this Superstitious fear, they, when they came to be Men and Women, put the doing of it off for several Reasons, and Pretences, which we learn out of the Writers of those times.

Some deferred it out of Worldly Love, and a Carnal loathness to renounce their sinful Pleasures, and take upon them the Yoke of Christ. Some put it off pretending want of leisure through multitude of worldly business; others out of laziness, and careless negligence. Others were wont to plead the insufficiency of their knowledge, others the inconveniency of the present time; others would not be Baptized, but at such a time, or in such a place, as such a City, or such a River, or by such a Person, or in such a Company. Some would put it off upon a pretence of not having such, or such Relations present, others would decline it upon the account of some small Expences, that attended it; others because they refused to confess their Sins, others because they favoured not the Doctrine of the Holy-Trinity, or to comply with the *Arians*; some because they would imitate the Example of Christ, who was not Baptized till the 30*th.* Year of his Age, and some out of fear of Persecution.

See Mr. Walker's Excellent Preface to his Treatise of Infant-Baptism.

This happened formerly to the great shame, and dishonour, of the Christian Religion, though the Fathers sharply and vehemently Wrote, and Preached against it; and therefore, upon supposition of the bare lawfulness, or indifferency, of Infant-Baptism, I can-

** Greg. Nazianz. Greg. Nyss. and St. Basil.*

not but approve the Wiſdom, and Prudence of thoſe Churches, which appoint it, becauſe the practice of it doth prevent ſuch ſhameful, and ſcandalous Neglects of Baptiſm, which to the great prejudice of Chriſtianity, as Experience hath taught us, would otherwiſe ariſe in the Church.

Thus much upon enquiry into the lawfulneſs, and expediency of Infant-Baptiſm, to ſhew Chriſtian Parents what an indiſpenſable Obligation lies upon their Conſciences to bring their Children to be Baptized in Obedience to the Church, which hath appointed Infant-Baptiſm; but then if Infant-Baptiſm be not only neceſſary becauſe the Church hath appointed it, but the Church hath appointed it becauſe it is neceſſary, and in any wiſe to be retained, then this antecedent ſort of neceſſity doth yet lay a ſtronger Obligation upon the Conſciences of Parents to initiate their Children as being moſt agreeable to the practice of the Apoſtles, and the Intention, and Will of Chriſt.

Firſt, As being moſt agreeable to the practice of the Apoſtles, who it is highly to be preſumed, authorized the practice of Infant-Baptiſm, becauſe, it was practiſed in the next Age unto them.

And Secondly, As being moſt agreeable to the Intention, and Will of Chriſt, who it is to be preſumed, would have forbidden, and countermanded the *Jewiſh* practice of initiating Infants, if he had not had a mind they ſhould be Baptized.

Wherefore * his very not repealing of that practice is a ſufficient Demonſtration, that it was his pleaſure it ſhould be continued; it was the practice of the *Jewiſh* Church before he came, and the practice of the *Church Chriſtian* not long after he departed, and we find the practice of it in the one harmoniouſly anſwering to the practice of it in the other; and therefore what

* Nam quum pædo-Baptiſmus in Eccleſiâ Judaicâ in admiſſione Proſelytorum ita fuit notus,

was

was before, and what was after his time, we may well preſume, was continued in the interim during the time of the Apoſtles, as his preſumed Will and Intention, who never did, or ſpoke any thing, that can reaſonably be interpreted, that he would have the *Jewiſh* cuſtom of admitting *Infants* into the Church, laid aſide, and therefore, his ſilence, and the ſilence of the Scriptures, are ſo far from being Arguments againſt *Infant-Baptiſm*, that conſidering the Antecedent uſage of it, they are very ſtrong Preſumptions for it, as the Learned Author in the Margent doth excellently prove.

uſitatus, & frequens, ut nihil ſerè nodus, uſitatius, & frequentius, non opus erat, ut aliquo præcepto roboraretur. Nam Chriſtus Baptiſmum in manus ſuas atque in uſum Evangelicum ſuſcepit, qualem invenit, hoc ſolùm addito, quod ad digniorem finem atque largiorem uſum promoverit. Novit ſatis gens univerſa parvulos ſolitos Baptizari: Illud præcepto opus non habuit, quod Communi uſu ſemper invaluerat. Si prodiret jam edictum regale in hæc verba: Recipiat ſe unuſquiſque die dominico ad publicum conventum in Eccleſiâ, inſaniet certè ille, quicunque olim hinc argueret non celebrandas eſſe die dominico in publicis conventibus preces, conciones, Pſalmodias, eo quod nulla in edicto de iis mentio. Nam cavit edictum de celebratione diei dominicæ in publicis conventibus in genere, de particularibus autem divini cultûs ſpeciebus ibidem celebrandis non opus erat, ut eſſet mentio, cum iſtæ ante datum edictum, & cum daretur, ſemper & ubique notæ eſſent, & in uſu aſſiduo. Ipſiſſimo hoc modo res ſe habuit cum Baptiſmo, Chriſtus cum inſtituit in Sacramentum Evangelicum, quo in profeſſionem Evangelii omnes admitterentur, ut olim in Proſelytiſmum ad Religionem Judaicum. Particularia eò ſpectantia modus ſcilicet Baptizandi ætas Baptizanda, ſexus Baptizandus &c. regulâ & definitione opus non habuerunt, eo quod hæc vel lippis & tenſoribus nota erant ex communi uſu. E contra ergo planâ & apertâ prohibitione opus erat, ut Infantes & parvuli non Baptizarentur, ſi eos Baptizandos nollet ſervator, —Si aboleri iſtam conſuetudinem vellet Chriſtus aperte prohibuiſſet. Silentium ergo ejus & Scripturæ pædo-baptiſmum firmat, & propagat. *Lightfoot Horæ Hebraicæ in* Matth. 3. 6.

To this purpoſe alſo, have I diſcourſed above, upon the Second and Third Queſtions; and therefore if Chriſt in the Reformation of the Church, from the Law into the Goſpel, did not repeal the Antient practice of *Infant-Baptiſm*, but left *Baptiſm* to be adminiſtred in the ſame Latitude, as before his time, then it muſt needs be concluded, that there lies the ſame Obligation upon Parents (abſtracting from the Commands of the

the Church) to deſire Baptiſm for their Children, as for grown Proſelytes to deſire it for themſelves.

For what authority ſoever enacts any thing concerning Children, or Perſons under the years of diſcretion, doth lay at leaſt an implicite Obligation upon Parents, and Pro-parents to ſee that act be performed. As if for Example, an Act of Parliament ſhould be made, that all Perſons, whatſoever, Men, Women, and Children, ſhould pay ſo much an Head unto the King, the Act, by the nature of it, would oblige Parents, and Pro-parents, to pay for their Children, and the Minors in their cuſtody, as well, as for themſelves. Or, if in the time of a general Contagion, the Supream Power ſhould command, that all Men, Women, and Children, ſhould every Morning take ſuch an Antidote, that Command would oblige Parents to give it unto their Children, as well, as to take it themſelves. Juſt ſo the Ordinance of Baptiſm being intended, or inſtituted by our Saviour in its ancient Latitude for Children, as well, as grown Perſons, it muſt needs lay an Obligation upon Parents, and Pro-parents to bring them to the Holy Sacrament, otherwiſe the Divine Inſtitution would in part be made void, and fruſtrated of the Ends for which it was inſtituted, as if it did not alſo lay an Obligation upon Adult Perſons to offer themſelves unto the Holy Sacrament, it would be of no force at all.

To ſum up all in ſhort. When our Lord firſt appointed Baptiſm, and afterwards ſaid, *Go, and Proſelyte all Nations Baptizing them*, &c. either he intended that Children ſhould be Baptized, as well as Grown Proſelytes, or he did not; if he did not intend they ſhould be Baptized, Why did he not plainly diſcover that Intention? Nay, Why did he not plainly forbid them to be Baptized, as they were wont to be, but if he

he intended they ſhould be Baptized according to the ancient cuſtom, then, according to the ancient cuſtom in the *Jewiſh* Church, Parents are as much bound to offer them unto Baptiſm, as Adult Believers, Men and Women, are bound to offer themſelves.

What I have here ſaid about the Obligation, which lies upon Parents to bring their Children unto Baptiſm, concerns all *Pro-parents* to whoſe care Children are committed, as *Guardians*, *Tutors*, and *Church-Wardens*; and leſt any ſhould ask, as ſome Sceptically do, at *What time they are bound to bring them unto Baptiſm?* As *ſoon, as they are born, or the next day after, or when?* I anſwer, by ſhewing the impertinency of that Queſtion, in reference to Grown Believers thus: *When muſt a Believing Man, or Woman be Baptized? As ſoon as he Believes, or the next day after, or when?* And truly the Anſwer is the ſame to both Queſtions, *at any time*, the Goſpel indulging a diſcretional Latitude in both Caſes, and only forbidding the wilful neglect of the Ordinance, and all unreaſonable, and needleſs delays thereof.

Queſt. V. *Whether it is lawful to Communicate with Believers, who were only Baptized in their Infancy?*

The ſtating of this, depends upon what I have ſaid upon the Second, and Third Queſtions, to prove, *That Infants are capable Subjects of Baptiſm, and that it is lawful to Baptize them*; and if I have not erred, as I hope I have not, in thoſe two Determinations, then the Baptiſm of Infants is lawful, and valid, and if the Baptiſm of them be lawful, and valid; then it cannot be unlawful to Communicate with them, when they come to be Men, and Women.

Accordingly,

Accordingly, it never entered into the Heart of any of the ancient Chriſtians to refuſe Communion with Grown Believers, who had been Baptized in their Infancy, whether they were Baptized in perfect health, as Children moſt commonly were, or only in danger of Death, as the Children of thoſe Novatian kind of Parents above mentioned always were, who were ſo far from thinking *Infant-Baptiſm* a Nullity, or Corruption of Baptiſm, that they thought it neceſſary for them in caſe of apparent danger, and durſt not let them die un-baptized.

Some others deferred the Baptizing of their Children, becauſe they thought them too weak to endure the Severities of the Trine immerſion, and others, perhaps, according to the private Opinion of * *Tertullian*, and ‖ *Nazianzen*, thought it more convenient to delay the Baptizing of them till they were capable of being Catechized between Three, and Four years old, but ſtill this delay of Baptiſm ſuppoſed their continuing in health, but in caſe of danger they thought it † neceſſary to Baptize them, and if they ſurvived the danger, looked upon them as lawfully, and validly Baptized.

* De Baptiſmo. c. 18 Alt quidem dominus, nolite illos prohibere ad me venire, veniant ergò dum adoleſcunt, veniant dum diſcunt, dum, quò veniant, docentur.

‖ Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων δίδωμι Γνώμην τὴν τριετίαν ἀναμεῖναντας, ἢ μικρὸν ἐντὸς τέλους, ἢ ὑπὲρ τοῦτο (νήπια γὰρ ἀκοῦσαι τὰ μυστικὰ, καὶ ἀπκρίνεσθαι δύνατον, εἰ καὶ μὴ συνιέντα τελέως, ἀλλ' ὧν τυπούμενα) ὅπως ἁγιάζειν καὶ ψυχας, καὶ Σώματα τῷ μεγάλῳ μυστηρίῳ τὰ πλειόστους. Orat. 40.

† Τί δ' ἂν εἴποις περὶ τῶν ἔτι νηπίων ------ ἢ καὶ ταῦτα Βαπτίζομεν; πάνυγε, εἰπέρ τις ἐπείγοι κίνδυνος. Κρεῖσσον γὰρ, ἀναδήτως ἁγιασθῆναι, ἢ ἀπελθεῖν ἀσφράγιστα, καὶ ἀτίλεστα.

These

Theſe were all the Pleas we read of for deferring the Baptiſm of Infants among the Ancients, who never urged this for one, that Infant-Baptiſm was unlawful, or invalid. No, They never argued againſt it from the want of thoſe pre-requiſite Conditions in Children, which Chriſt, and the Apoſtles required in Adult Proſelytes, nor from the want of Precept, and Example for it in the New Teſtament, but ſo underſtood the Scriptures, as to think it as lawful, and warrantable as the Baptiſm of Grown Believers, and neceſſary in caſe of danger; and juſt ſo did thoſe, who deferred their Baptiſm, for fear of ſinning after it, think the Baptiſm of Men and Women only neceſſary at the laſt extremity in apparent danger of Death.

But then if the ordinary practice of Infant-Baptiſm be not only lawful, and valid, but alſo neceſſary, as appearing moſt agreeable to the preſumed Will of Chriſt, who did not countermand the practice of it, and moſt conformable to the practice of the Apoſtles, as can be proved from the practice of the very next Age unto them; then it muſt not only be lawful to Communicate with Believers, who were Baptized in their Infancy, but an exceeding great Sin, and Preſumption to refuſe Communion with them upon that account.

In a word, If *Infant-Baptiſm* be not only lawful, but neceſſary, what a grievous, and provoking Sin, muſt it needs be, to diſown thoſe for Members of Chriſt's Body, whom he owns to be ſuch? but if it be neither, as *Anabaptiſts* vanely pretend, then there hath not been a true Church upon the Face of the Earth, for Eleven hundred Years, nor a Church, for above Fifteen hundred, with which a true Chriſtian could Communicate without Sin.

This is a very absurd, and dreadful consequence, and *inconsistent* with the purity of the Apostolical Ages, while the Church was so full of Saints, Martyrs, and Miracles, and represented as * Symmetral by the Spirit of God under the Symbol of Measuring the Temple of God, and the Altar. *Revel.* 11. 1, 2.

* *See Dr. More's Apocalypsis Apoc. Prefact.* p. 20. *and on the* 11. *ch. of the Rev.* v. 1, 2.

The CONCLUSION.

Although in the management of this Controversy against the *Anabaptists*, I have endeavoured so to state the Case of *Infant-Baptism*, as to obviate, or answer all the Considerable Pleas, and Material Objections, which they are wont to make against it; yet there are two of their Objections, of which I have yet taken no notice, thinking it better, that I might avoid tediousness, and confusion in determining upon the preceding Questions, to Propose, and Answer them apart by themselves.

The First of these two, is the ancient Custom of *giving the Communion unto Infants*, which they endeavour with all their Art, and Skill to run Parallel with the practice of *Infant-Baptism*, although there is not the like Evidence, nor the like Reason for the practice of that, as there is for the practice of this.

First,

First, There is not the like Evidence for the practice of it, St. * *Cyprian* being the first Author, which they can produce for it, and after him the ‖ Author of the Book of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, and † *Cyril of* Jerusalem, are the next, who make mention of it towards the latter end of the Fourth Century, and then St. ** *Augustin* in the Fifth; who indeed speaks frequently of it, as of the practice of the Church in that Age.

* Ac nequid deesset ad criminis cumulum Infantes quoque parentum manibus vel imposti, vel attracti: amiserunt parvuli, quod in primo statim Nativitatis Exordio fuerunt consecuti. Nonne illi cum judicii dies venerit, dicent: Nos nihil fecimus, nec *derelicto cibo, ac poculo domini* ad profana contagia sponte properavimus. Afterwards he tells a Story of a little Girl, who having been carried to the Idol-Feasts, was afterwards brought by her Mother, who knew nothing of it, to the Communion, when he administred it, and when the Deacon brought the Cup to her, she turned away her Face from it, but the Deacon pouring some of the Wine into her Mouth, she fell into Convulsions, and Vomitings, which the Holy Father looking upon, as a Miracle, did thereupon discover, that she had been polluted at the Idol-Feasts. Vid. & *August.* ad *Bonifacium* Episcop. Ep. 23. vol. 2.

‖ Cap. 7. Contemplat. 3. p. 360, 362.

† Catechesis 3. illuminat. Hierosolym.

** De verbis domini in Evang. Johan. Epist. 23. 106, 107. Lib. 1, de peccatorum merit. & remiss. cap. 20. lib. 2. Contra Julianum c. 11. Contra duas Epistolas Pelag. Lib. 2. cap. 22. lib. 4. cap. 14.

These are all the Authorities for *Infant-Communion*, that I know of, till St. *Augustin*'s time, whereas besides the authority of St. *Cyprian*, which is the first they have for Communicating *Infants*, we have the authority of a whole Council of Fathers, in which he presided, and of *Origen*, *Tertullian*, and *Irenæus*, who was the Scholar of St. *Polycarp*, and the *Grand-Scholar* of St. *John*.

* See them all cited at large in *Walker's* Plea for Infant-Baptism, from p. 266. to p. 275.

And then, whereas among the Writers of the 4th. Century, there are but the two above-cited, who make mention of *Infant-Communion*, we have St. * *Hierom*, St. *Ambrose*, St. *Chrysostome*, St. *Athanasius*, St. *Gregory*

Gregory Nazianzen, and the third *Council of Carthage*, who all ſpeak of *Infant-Baptiſm*, as of a thing generally practiſed, and moſt of them, as of a thing, which ought to be practiſed in the Church.

Furthermore, none of the four Teſtimonies for *Infant-Communion*, ſpeak of it, as of an *Apoſtolical Tradition*, as *Origen* doth of *Infant-Baptiſm*, not to mention that the *Pelagians*, never owned the neceſſity of *Infant Communion*, as they did of *Infant-Baptiſm*: All which things conſidered, ſhew that there is nothing neer the like Evidence in Antiquity for the practiſe of the one, as there is for that of the other.

And as there is not the like evidence for the conſtant, ſucceſſive, and general practice of *Infant-Communion*, that there is for *Infant-Baptiſm:* So there is not the like Reaſon for the practice of it.

Firſt, becauſe Baptiſm is the Sacrament, or *Myſtery of Initiation*, of which Perſons of all Ages are capable, it being inſtituted chiefly for an initiatory Sign to ſolemnize the admiſſion of the Baptized Perſon into the Church, and to Seal all the Bleſſings of the Goſpel unto him, as a Member of Chriſt. This is the Subſtance, or Chief end of Baptiſm; which, as I have ſhewed upon the Second, and Fourth Queſtions, is equally anſwered in the Baptiſm of Children, as well as of profeſſing Believers; Confeſſion of Faith, as well as Confeſſion of Sins, being but accidental Circumſtantials, which are neceſſary with reſpect to the State of the Perſon to be Baptized, but not to Baptiſm it ſelf. But on the contrary, the Holy Euchariſt, or Communion, is the *Sacrament of Perfection*, and Conſummation in the Chriſtian Religion, being primarily, and chiefly inſtituted for a Sacrificial Feaſt in remembrance of Chriſt's Death, and Paſſion, which being

being an act of great Knowledge and Piety, Children are not capable to perform.

But Secondly, There is not the like Reaſon for Baptizing, and Communicating Infants, becauſe that is grounded upon the authority of many Texts of Scripture, which without the Concurrence of Tradition are fairly, and genuinely interpretable for it; but this is grounded only upon one Text [John 6. 53. *Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood ye have no life in you*] which it is doubtful whether it is to be underſtood of the Holy Euchariſt, or no, becauſe it cannot be underſtood of it but in a *proleptical ſence*, the Lord's Supper having not been yet inſtituted by him; or if it be to be ſo underſtood, yet the ſence of it ought to be regulated by the Chief end of its *Inſtitution* contained in thoſe words of our bleſſed Saviour, *do this in remembrance of me*, and this do ye, *as oft, as ye drink it in remembrance of me*. Wherefore though this Text were literally to be underſtood of the Holy Euchariſt, as St. *Auguſtin* firſt interprets it, yet it ought not to be ſtrained to *Infant-Communion*, becauſe Infants cannot partake of the Holy Banquet in *remembrance of Chriſt*. And therefore though the Cuſtom of *Communicating Infants* prevailed by Degrees in ſome Ages of the Church, yet the Weſtern Churches diſcerning the miſtake upon which it was grounded, have long ſince laid it aſide, though they ſtill continue the practice of *Infant-Baptiſm*, as fully anſwering the Chief end of Baptiſm, and as being founded upon more, and clearer Texts of Scriptures, and a much more noble Tradition, then *Infant-Communion* is.

But Thirdly, There is not the like reaſon for Baptizing, and Communicating Infants, becauſe the Correſpondent practice of the *Jewiſh* Church in *Infant-Circumciſion*, and *Infant-Baptiſm*, anſwered as a Pat-

tern

tern unto that under the Law, but there was nothing of a Pattern under it, which answered so to *Infant-Communion*, because a Child never pertook of the * Passeover, before he was old enough to take his Father by the hand, and to go up from the Gates of *Jerusalem* unto the Mount of the Temple, and to enquire about the meaning of the Service, and was capable of understanding the nature of it, as it was done in remembrance of their Deliverance out of *Egypt*.

*Exod. 12. 26, 27.

And in like manner when the Children of Christians are old enough to be instructed in the nature of the Holy Communion, and to understand that, then they may partake of it, be it as soon, as it will, if they are Baptized and Confirmed; though it is true, that Christian Children are usually much older, then the *Jewish* were, before they Communicate, which is merely accidental, because it requires a riper reason to understand the Mystery of the Holy Eucharist, which is done in remembrance of our Spiritual Deliverance by the Sacrifice of Christ, both God and Man, upon the Cross, then to understand the plain and easie meaning of the Passeover, which was annually kept in remembrance of the Temporal Deliverance of the *Jews*.

But to speak yet more fully of *Infant-Communion*, the practice of it is so far from prejudicing the Cause of *Infant-Baptism*, that it mightily confirms it, because none were, or could be admitted to pertake of the Holy Communion, till they were validly * Baptized, and therefore the practice of *Infant-Communion* is a most emphatical Declaration, that all the Churches, wherein it ever was, or || still is practised, were of Opinion that the Baptism of *Infants* was as lawful, and valid, as that of professing Believers can be.

* Theodoret. Therapeut. Serm. 2. Ἀτέλεστος, δὴ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων ἀμύητος.

|| As in the *Greek*, *Russian*, and *Abyssin* Churches, and among the Christians of St. *Thomas* in the *Indies*.

As

As for the Original of this custom it, is not known when it began, probably it came in by degrees from the ancient, and laudable custom of administring the Lord's Supper to grown Persons presently after their Baptism; and if so many of the ancient Churches were so tender towards *Infants*, as to bring them to the *Communion*, rather then deprive them of the least shadow of right, what shall be said in excuse of those uncharitable Men, who will rather destroy all the Churches in the World, then bring their Children unto Baptism, of which they are capable, and to which they have a Right so highly probable, if not certain, and infallible, as I have proved above?

The Second Objection against *Infant-Baptism*, which I took no notice of, but reserved for this place, is taken *from their incapacity to engage themselves in Covenant unto God*. For, say these Men, all who enter into *Covenant*, and receive the Seal of the *Covenant*, must contract, and stipulate for their parts, as well as God doth for his, and therefore *St. Peter* saith, That *the Baptism which saveth us, must have the answer, or restipulation of a good Conscience towards God*. But how can *Infants* restipulate, or what *Conscience* can be in them, who have not the use of reason, nor are capable of knowing what the *Covenant* means? 1 Ep. 3. 21.

To this Objection, I answer as formerly, That it is as strong against *Infant-Circumcision*, as *Infant-Baptism*; for the *Infants* of the *Jews* were admitted as effectually into the *Covenant*, and had it as really sealed unto them, and were as strongly tyed to perform the *Conditions* of it, when they came to years of *understanding*, as if they had been Circumcised then, and at their Circumcision had personally, and exprelly *indented* with God. Wherefore

Wherefore the ſame anſwer, which will ſerve to juſtifie *Infant-Circumciſion* will juſtifie *Infant-Baptiſm*, which ſucceeds in the place of it, and it is this: That God of his goodneſs towards *Infants* was pleaſed to ſeal the *Covenant* of Grace unto *Infants* upon an *implicite*, and *imputative* ſort of Stipulation, which at years of underſtanding they were bound to own by openly profeſſing the *Jewiſh Religion*, or if they then renounced it, thereupon they became Strangers to the *Covenant*, which in ſuch caſes was as void, as if it had never been made. An implicit Stipulation was ſufficient for the Children of Believers, though an open Profeſſion, and Stipulation was required of Grown Proſelytes, which ſhews, that *Circumciſion* was an inſtitution of *Latitude*, and that perſonal, and expreſs Reſtipulation was not a general pre-requiſite condition to Circumciſion, but only to ſome Perſons to be Circumciſed.

In like manner Baptiſm being an *inſtitution of Latitude*, ordained for Perſons under, as well as at the years of diſcretion, perſonal and expreſs Stipulation is only required of the former; and therefore St. *Peter* in the Text above cited likely had reſpect not to all Baptiſm, or Baptiſm in general, but only to the Baptiſm of Adult Proſelytes, whom the Miniſter uſed to * interrogate at the time of Baptiſm, much after the ſame manner, as we interrogate Adult Proſelytes now.

* *Hence* Tertullian de Bapti-mo *calls* Baptiſm Sponſionem Salutis. *And ſo* St. Cyprian *we often read of the interrogation in Baptiſm.*

Wherefore, this Objection like the reſt which the *Anabaptiſts* make, runs upon this preſumption, that Baptiſm is a ſtrict inſtitution, and that perſonal and expreſs anſwering or Reſtipulation is a pre-requiſite

condition

condition to all Baptism, whereas it is only a personal qualification required of Majors, or Adult Persons, when they come to be Baptized.

But as for Children, Baptism may be administred unto them upon an implicite, and imputative sort of Restipulation, as Circumcision was to the *Jewish*, and Baptism now is to *agonizing Christian Infants*, or else it may be administred unto them as Baptism formerly was among the *Jews* to the *Infants*, and *Minors* of Proselytes upon a *vicarious* Restipulation by their *Sponsors*, which seems to have been translated together with the use of Baptism from the *Jewish* Church. It is certain, that * *Tertullian* makes mention of *Sponsors*, or Sureties for Children at Baptism, and very probable, that the Apostles made *Parents*, and *Majordomos* stipulate in the name of their || *Minors*, when they Baptized them, as the *Jews* were wont to do; and upon this Supposition St. *Peter* in the Text above cited, might also probably allude to all Baptism, because Grown Proselytes to the *Christian Religion* did answer for their *Children*, as well as for themselves at Baptism, according to the Custom of the *Jewish* Church.

* De Baptismo. cap. 18. quid enim necesse est Sponsores etiam periculo ingerl?

|| Præfecturæ igitur juridicæ, quæ Baptismo præerat profitebatur Proselytus ipse Majorennis (Masculus qui annum decimum tertium, fœmina quæ duodecim superaverat) legem Mosaicam se servaturum. Minorum verò nomine idem ipsum profitebatur præfectura ipsa, uti in Christianismo susceptores minorennium, seu parvulorum, saltem si nec parentes adessent, qui idem præstare possent. Selden de Synedriis. Lib. 1. c. 3. *And what is here said of the CONSISTORY among the Jews, concerning the Baptism of Infants, and Minors, St.* Augustine *saith of the* Church *among Christians*, accommodat illis mater Ecclesia aliorum pedes ut veniant, aliorum cor, ut credant, aliorum linguam ut fateantur.

Nay, there is little reason to doubt, but that the *Jewish* being the Pattern of the *Christian Baptism*, the Apostles, and their Assistants who were *Jews*, or *Hellenists*, did observe this Custom of *Vicarious Stipulation* at the Baptism of *Infants*, and *Minors*, as well

as all the other Particulars, in which they resemble one another, as the Picture doth the Face, whose Picture it is.

As for Example, the *Jewish Baptism* was administred to Women, as well as Men, and so is the Christian.

Secondly, It was never reiterated nor repeated, no more is the Christian.

Thirdly, It was called Regeneration, and a New Birth, and Baptized Persons were said to be born again and Regenerated, which also holds in Christian Baptism.

Fourthly, Baptized Proselytes among the *Jews* were bound to leave their nearest Relations, if it were necessary, and adhere to the Church, and so are Baptized Christian Proselytes bound to do the same.

Fifthly, The Infants of Proselytes were Baptized among the *Jews*, as well as the Proselytes themselves, and so have I proved, that Infants have been always Baptized among the Christians.

And therefore in the Last place, Since the *Jewish* Church Baptized Infants upon *Vicarious Stipulation*, why should not we think it sufficient for their entrance into the *Covenant*, and that the Apostles did so too?

These things, and whatsoever else is written in this little Tract, I hope will be fairly, and candidly considered by the Dissenters among us upon the account of *Infant-Baptism*. I say, the truth in Christ, I lye not, my *Conscience* also bearing me Witness in the *Holy Ghost*, who is the Searcher of Hearts, that I have great heaviness, and almost continual sorrow in my heart for them, and that to reconcile them to the Church,

Church. I could wish in the Apostles Sence, that I my self were an *Anathema* from Christ. And because it is a Disease too common among Dissenters, and more especially among those, with whom I have been a dealing, to have minds full of Prejudice, Prepossession, and siniſter Suspitions against what we Speak, or Preach, or Write, I have here subjoined a Letter of that Famous Martyr of Jesus Christ Mr. *John Philpot*, concerning *Infant-Baptism*, which I seriously recommend to their Impartial, and diligent perusal, hoping that the same Arguments, which may perhaps have less effect upon them as they come from me, may be better received, and make deeper impression upon their Souls as they come from him, who like the Primitive Martyrs, was Blessed with Heavenly Visions, and chearfully suffered for his Redeemer, who had suffered for him, and thanked God when the time was come, that he was to seal the truth of the *Protestant Religion* with his Blood.

A Letter of Mr. Philpot, *to a Friend of his, Priſoner the ſame time in* Newgate: *Wherein is debated and diſcuſſed the matter or queſtion of* Infants *to be* Baptized.

Book of Martyrs, 3. vol. p. 606. Col. 2. London. 164 1.

THE God of all Light and Underſtanding lighten your Heart with all true Knowledge of his Word, and make you perfect to the day of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, whereunto you are now called, through the mighty operation of his Holy Spirit, *Amen.*

I received Yeſternight from you, (Dear Brother *S.* and Fellow-Priſoner for the truth for Chriſt's Goſpel) a Letter, wherein you gently require my Judgment, concerning the Baptiſm of *Infants*, which is the effect thereof. And before I do ſhew you what I have learned out of God's Word, and of his true Infallible Church, touching the ſame, I think it not out of the matter, firſt to declare what Viſion I had the ſame Night whilſt muſing on your Letter I fell aſleep, knowing that God doth not without cauſe reveal to his People who have their Minds fixed on him, Special and Spiritual Revelations to their Comfort, as a taſt of their Joy and Kingdom to come, which Fleſh and Blood cannot comprehend.

Being

Being in the midst of my sweet rest, it seemed to me to see a great beautiful City all of the colour of Azure, and white, four square in a marvellous beautiful composition in the midst of the Skie, the sight whereof so inwardly comforted me, that I am not able to express the consolation I had thereof, yea, the remembrance thereof causeth my Heart as yet to leap for Joy: And as Charity is no Churle, but would others to be Partakers of his delight, so methought I called to others (I cannot tell whom) and whilst they came and we together beheld the same, by and by to my great Grief it vaded away.

This Dream I think not to have come of the illusion of the Senses, because it brought with it so much Spiritual Joy, and I take it to be of the working of God's Spirit for the contentation of your Request, as he wrought in *Peter* to satisfie *Cornelius*. Therefore I Interpret this Beautiful City to be the Glorious Church of Christ, and the appearance of it in the Skie, signifieth the Heavenly State thereof, whose Conversation is in Heaven, and that according to the Primitive Church, which is now in Heaven, Men ought to measure and judge the Church of Christ now in Earth; for as the Prophet *David* saith, *The Foundations thereof be in the Holy Hills, and glorious things be spoken of the City of God.* And the marvellous quadrature of the same, I take to signifie the universal agreement in the same, and that all the Church here Militant ought to consent to the Primitive Church throughout the four Parts of the World, as the Prophet affirmeth, saying; *God maketh us to dwell after one manner in one House.* And that I conceived so wonderful Joy at the Contemplation thereof, I understand the unspeakable Joy which they have that be at Unity with Christ's Primitive Church: For there is Joy in the Holy Ghost, and Peace, which passeth

passeth all Understanding, as it is written in the Psalms: *As of Joyful Persons is the dwelling of all them that be in thee.* And that I called others to the fruition of this Vision, and to behold this wonderful City, I construe it by the Will of God this Vision to have come upon me, musing on your Letter, to the end, that under this Figure I might have occasion to move you with many others, to behold the Primitive Church in all your Opinions concerning Faith, and to conform your self in all points to the same, which is the Pillar and Establishment of truth, and teacheth the true use of the Sacraments, and having with a greater fulness than we have now, the first fruits of the Holy Ghost, did declare the true Interpretation of the Scriptures according to all verity, even as our Saviour promised to send them another Comforter, which should teach them all truth.

And since all truth was taught and revealed to the Primitive Church, which is our Mother, let us all that be obedient Children of God, submit our selves to the judgment of the Church for the better understanding of the Articles of our Faith, and of the doubtful Sentences of the Scripture. Let us not go about to shew in us, by following any private Man's Interpretation upon the Word, another Spirit than they of the Primitive Church had, lest we deceive our selves. For there is but one Faith and one Spirit, which is not contrary to himself, neither otherwise now teacheth us than he did them. Therefore let us believe as they have taught us of the Scriptures, and be at peace with them, according as the true Catholick Church is at this day: And the God of Peace assuredly will be with us, and deliver us out of all our Worldly Troubles and Miseries, and make us Partakers of their Joy and Bliss, through our Obedience to Faith with them.

Therefore

Therefore God commandeth us in *Job*, to ask of the Elder Generation, and to search diligently the memory of the Fathers. For we are but Yesterdays Children, and be ignorant, and our days are like a Shadow, and they shall teach thee (saith the Lord) and speak to thee, and shall utter words from their Hearts. And by *Solomon* we are commanded, not to reject the direction of our Mother. The Lord grant you to direct your steps in all things after her, and to abhor contention with her. For as St. *Paul* writeth; *If any Man be contentious, neither we, neither the Church of God hath any such custom.* Job. 8. Prov. 6. 1 Cor. 11.

Hitherto have shewed you (good Brother S.) my Judgment generally of that you stand in doubt and dissent from others, to the which I wish you as mine own Heart to be conformable, and then doubtless you cannot err, but boldly may be glad in your Troubles, and Triumph at the hour of your Death, that you shall die in the Church of God a Faithful Martyr, and receive the Crown of Eternal Glory. And thus much have I written upon the occasion of a Vision before God unfeigned. But that you may not think that I go about to satisfie you with uncertain Visions only, and not after God's Word, I will take the ground of your Letter, and specially answer to the same by the Scriptures and by infallible reasons deduced out of the same, and prove the Baptism of Infants to be lawful, commendable, and necessary, whereof you seem to stand in doubt.

Indeed if you look upon the Papistical Synagogue only, which hath corrupted God's Word by false Interpretations, and hath perverted the true use of Christ's Sacraments, you might seem to have good handfast of your Opinion against the Baptism of Infants. But forasmuch as it is of more Antiquity, and hath his beginning

ginning from God's Word, and from the uſe of the Primitive Church, it muſt not in reſpect of the abuſe in the *Popiſh* Church be neglected, or thought not expedient to be uſed in Chriſt's Church. *Auxentius* one of the *Arians* Sect, with his Adherents, was one of the firſt that denied the Baptiſm of Children, and next after him *Pelagius* the Heretick, and ſome other there were in St. *Bernard*'s time, as it doth appear by his Writings, and in our days the *Anabaptiſts*, and Inordinate kind of Men ſtirred up by the Devil, to the deſtruction of the Goſpel. But the Catholick truth delivered unto us by the Scriptures, plainly determineth, that all ſuch are to be Baptized, as whom God acknowledgeth for his People, and vouchſafeth them worthy of Sanctification or Remiſſion of their Sins. Therefore ſince that Infants be in the number or ſcroll of God's People, and be Partakers of the Promiſe by their Purification in Chriſt, it muſt needs follow thereby, that they ought to be Baptized as well as thoſe that can Profeſs their Faith. For we judge the People of GOD as well by the free and liberal Promiſe of God, as by the Confeſſion of Faith. For to whomſoever God promiſeth himſelf to be their God, and whom he acknowledgeth for his, thoſe no Man without great Impiety may exclude from the number of the Faithful. But God promiſeth, that he will not only be the God of ſuch as do profeſs him, but alſo of Infants, promiſing them his Grace and Remiſſion of Sins, as it appeareth by the words of the Covenant made unto *Abraham*. *I will ſet my Covenant between thee and me* (ſaith the Lord) *and between thy Seed after thee in their Generations, with an everlaſting Covenant, to be thy God, and the God of thy Seed after thee.* To the which Covenant Circumciſion was added to be a ſign of Sanctification as well in Children as in Men; and no Man

Gen. 17.

may

may think that this Promiſe is abrogated with Circumciſion and other Ceremonial Laws. For Chriſt came to fulfil the Promiſes, and not to diſſolve them. Therefore in the Goſpel he ſaith of *Infants*, that is, of ſuch as yet believed not; *Let the little Ones come unto me, and forbid them not, for of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven.* Again, *It is not the Will of your Father which is in Heaven, that any of theſe little Ones do periſh.* Alſo, *He that receiveth one ſuch little Child in my Name, receiveth me. Take heed therefore that ye deſpiſe not one of theſe Babes, for I tell you, their Angels do continually ſee in Heaven my Fathers Face.* And what may be ſaid more plainer than this; It is not the Will of the Heavenly Father, that the Infants ſhould periſh? Whereby we may gather that he receiveth them freely unto his Grace, although as yet they confeſs not their Faith. Since then that the Word of the Promiſe, which is contained in Baptiſm, pertaineth as well to Children as to Men, why ſhould the ſign of the Promiſe, which is Baptiſm in Water, be withdrawn from Children, when Chriſt himſelf commandeth them to be received of us, and promiſeth the Reward of a Prophet to thoſe that receive ſuch a little Infant, as he for an Example did put before his Diſciples?

Matth. 5. Matth. 10. Matth. 19. Matth. 18.

Now will I prove with manifeſt Arguments, that Children ought to be Baptized, and that the Apoſtles of Chriſt did Baptize Children. The Lord commanded his Apoſtles to Baptize all Nations; therefore alſo Children ought to be Baptized, for they are comprehended under this Word, *All Nations.*

Mat. 28.

Further, whom God doth account among the faithful, they are faithful, for it was ſaid to *Peter, That thing which God hath purified, thou ſhalt not ſay to be common or unclean:* But GOD doth repute Children among the Faithful: *Ergo*, they be faithful, except

Acts 10.

we had rather to reſiſt God, and ſeem ſtronger and wiſer than he.

1 Cor. 1. And without all doubt the Apoſtles Baptized thoſe which Chriſt commanded: But he commanded the Faithful to be Baptized, among the which Infants be reckoned: The Apoſtles then Baptized Infants.

The Goſpel is more than Baptiſm, for *Paul* ſaid;

1 Cor. 1. *The Lord ſent me to Preach the Goſpel, and not to Baptize*: Not that he denied abſolutely that he was ſent to Baptize, but that he preferred Doctrine before Baptiſm, for the Lord commanded both to the Apoſtles: but Children be received by the Doctrine of the Goſpel of God, and not refuſed: Therefore what Perſon being of reaſon may deny them Baptiſm, which is a thing leſſer than the Goſpel? For in the Sacraments be two things to be conſidered, the thing ſignified, and the Sign, and thing ſignified is greater than the Sign, and from the thing ſignified in Baptiſm, Children are not excluded; who therefore may deny them the Sign, which is Baptiſm in Water?

St. *Peter* could not deny them to be Baptized in Water, to whom he ſaw the Holy Ghoſt given, which is the certain Sign of God's People: For he ſaith in the

Acts 10. *Acts, May any body forbid them to be Baptized in Water, who have received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we?* Therefore St. *Peter* denied not Baptiſm to Infants, for he knew certainly both by the Doctrine of Chriſt, and by the Covenant which is everlaſting, that the Kingdom of Heaven pertained to Infants.

Rom. 8. None be received into the Kingdom of Heaven, but ſuch as God loveth, and which are endued with his Spirit: For whoſo hath not the Spirit of God, he is none of his. But Infants be beloved of God, and therefore want not the Spirit of God: Wherefore if they have the Spirit of God as well as Men, if they be numbred

numbred among the People of God as well as we that be of Age, who (I pray you) may well withstand Children to be Baptized with Water, in the Name of the Lord?

The Apostles in times past being yet not sufficiently instructed, did murmur against those which brought their Children unto the Lord, but the Lord rebuked them, and said; *Let the Babes come unto me.* Why then do not these Rebellious *Anabaptists* obey the Commandement of the Lord? For what do they now a-days else that bring their Children to Baptism, than that they did in times past, which brought their Children to the Lord, and our Lord received them, and putting his hands on them, Blessed them, and both by Words and by Gentle Behaviour towards them, declared manifestly that Children be the People of God, and entirely beloved of GOD? But some will say, Why then did not Christ Baptize them? Because it is Written, Jesus himself Baptized not, but his Disciples. Matth. 10.

Moreover, Circumcision in the old Law was ministred to Infants; therefore Baptism ought to be ministred in the new Law unto Children. For Baptism is come in the stead of Circumcision, as St. *Paul* witnesseth, saying to the *Colossians*; *By Christ ye are Circumcised with a Circumcision which is without hands, when ye put off the body of sin of the Flesh, by the Circumcision of Christ, being buried together with him through Baptism.* Behold, *Paul* calleth Baptism the Circumcision of a Christian Man, which is done without hands, not that Water may be ministred without hands, but that with hands no Man any longer ought to be Circumcised, albeit the Mystery of Circumcision do still remain in Faithful People. John 4. Colos. 2.

To this I may add, That the Servants of God were always ready to minister the Sacraments to them, for whom they were instituted. As for an Example, we may behold *Josua*, who most diligently procured the
Jos. 5. People of *Israel* to be Circumcised before they entred into the Land of Promise; but since the Apostles were the Preachers of the Word, and the very Faithful Servants of Jesus Christ, who may hereafter doubt that they Baptized Infants, since Baptism is in place of Circumcision?

Item, The Apostles did attemperate all their doings to the Shadows and Figures of the Old Testament: Therefore it is certain that they did attemperate Baptism accordingly to Circumcision, and Baptized Children because they were under the Figure of Baptism; for the People of *Israel* passed through the Red Sea, and the bottom of the Water of *Jordan*, with their Children. And although the Children be not always expressed, neither the Women in the Holy Scriptures, yet they are comprehended and understood in the same.

Also the Scripture evidently telleth us, That the Apostles baptized whole Families or Households: But the Children be comprehended in a Family or Household, as the chiefest and dearest part thereof: Therefore we may conclude, that the Apostles did baptize Infants or Children, and not only Men of lawful age. And that the House or Household is taken for Man, Woman, and Child, it is manifest in the 17. of *Genesis*, and also in that *Joseph* doth call *Jacob* with all his House, to come out of the Land of *Canaan* into *Egypt*.

Finally, I can declare out of ancient Writers, that the Baptism of Infants hath continued from the Apostles time unto ours, neither that it was instituted by

any

any Councels, neither of the Pope, nor of other Men, but commended from the Scripture by the Apostles themselves. *Origen* upon the Declaration of St. *Paul's* Epistle to the *Romans*, expounding the sixth Chapter, saith, *That the Church of Christ received the Baptism of Infants from the very Apostles.* St. *Hierome* maketh mention of the Baptism of Infants, in the third book against the *Pelagians*, and in his Epistle to *Leta.* St. *Augustine* reciteth for this purpose, a place out of *John*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, in his first book against *Julian*, Chap. 2. and he again writing to St. *Hierome* Epist. 28. saith, *That Saint* Cyprian *not making any new Decree, but firmly observing the Faith of the Church, judged with his fellow Bishops, that as soon as one was born, he might be lawfully Baptized.* The place of *Cyprian* is to be seen in his Epistle to *Fidus.* Hebr. 11.

Also St. *Augustine* in writing against the *Donatists* in the fourth Book Chap. 23. and 24. saith, *That the Baptism of Infants was not derived from the authority of Man, neither of Councels, but from the Tradition or Doctrine of the Apostles.*

Cyril upon *Leviticus* Chapter 8. approveth the Baptism of Children, and condemneth the iteration of Baptism. These Authorities of Men I do alledge, not to tie the Baptism of Children unto the Testimonies of Men, but to shew how Mens Testimonies do agree with God's Word, and that the verity of Antiquity is on our side, and that the *Anabaptists* have nothing but Lies for them, and new Imaginations, which feign the Baptism of Children to be the Pope's Commandement.

After this will I answer to the sum of your Arguments for the contrary. The first, which includeth all the rest, is, It is Written, *Go ye into all the World, and Preach the glad Tidings to all Creatures. He that believeth*

believeth and is Baptized, ſhall be Saved: But he that believeth not ſhall be Damned, &c.

To this I anſwer, That nothing is added to God's Word by Baptiſm of Children, as you pretend, but that is done which the ſame Word doth require, for that Children are accounted of Chriſt in the Goſpel among the number of ſuch as believe, as it appeareth by theſe words; *He that offendeth one of theſe little Babes which believe in me, it were better for him to have a Milſtone tyed about his Neck, and to be caſt into the bottom of the Sea.* Where plainly Chriſt calleth ſuch as be not able to confeſs their Faith, Believers; becauſe of his mere Grace he reputeth them for Believers. And this is no Wonder ſo to be taken, ſince God imputeth Faith for Righteouſneſs unto Men that be of riper Age: For both in Men and Children, Righteouſneſs, Acceptation, or Sanctification is of mere Grace and by Imputation, that the Glory of God's Grace might be praiſed.

Mat. 18.

And that the Children of Faithful Parents are Sanctified, and among ſuch as do believe, is apparent in the 1 *Cor.* 7. And whereas you do gather by the order of the words in the ſaid Commandement of Chriſt, that Children ought to be taught before they be Baptized, and to this end you alledge many places out of the *Acts*, proving that ſuch as Confeſſed their Faith firſt, were Baptized after: I anſwer, That if the order of words might weigh any thing to this Cauſe, we have the Scripture that maketh as well for us. For in * Saint *Mark* we read, that *John* did Baptize in the Deſart, Preaching the Baptiſm of Repentance. In the which place we ſee Baptizing go before, and Preaching to follow after.

1 Cor. 7.

* Mark 1.

And

And also I will declare this place of *Matthew* exactly considered, to make for the use of Baptism in Children, for Saint *Matthew* hath it written in this wise; *All Power is given me* (saith the Lord) *in Heaven and in Earth*, therefore going forth μαθητευσατε, that is, *Disciple ye*, (as I may express the signification of the Word;) that is, make or gather to me Disciples of all Nations. And following, he declareth the way how they should gather to him Disciples out of all Nations, *baptizing them and teaching*; by baptizing and teaching ye shall procure a Church to me. And both these aptly and briefly severally he setteth forth, saying, *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.* Now then Baptism goeth before Doctrine. Mat. 28.

But hereby I do not gather; that the Gentiles which never heard any thing before of God, and of the Son of God, and of the Holy Ghost, ought to be Baptized, neither they would permit themselves to be Baptized before they knew to what end. But this I have declared to shew you upon how feeble Foundation the *Anabaptists* be grounded. And plainly it is not true which they imagine of this Text, that the Lord did only command such to be Baptized whom the Apostles had first of all taught. Neither here verily is signified who only be to be Baptized, but he speaketh of such as be of perfect age, and of the first Foundations of Faith, and of the Church to be planted among the Gentiles, which were as yet rude and ignorant of Religion.

Such as be of Age may hear, believe, and confess, that which is Preached and taught, but so cannot Infants; therefore we may justly collect, that he speak-

eth

eth here nothing of Infants or Children. But for all this they be not to be excluded from Baptiſm.

It is a general rule; *He that doth not Labour, muſt not Eat.* But who is ſo barbarous that might think hereby, that Children ſhould be Famiſhed?

The Lord ſent his Apoſtles at the beginning of the ſetting up his true Religion unto all Nations, unto ſuch as were both ignorant of God, and were out of the Covenant of God; and truly ſuch Perſons it behoved not firſt to be Baptized, and afterward taught; but firſt to be taught, and after baptized. If at this day we ſhould go to the *Turks* to Convert them to the Faith of Chriſt, verily firſt we ought to teach them, and afterward Baptize ſuch as would yield to be the Servants of Chriſt. Likewiſe the Lord himſelf in times paſt did, when firſt he renewed the Covenant with *Abraham*, and ordained Circumciſion to be a Seal of the Covenant after that *Abraham* was Circumciſed. But he, when he perceived the Infants alſo to pertain to the Covenant, and that Circumciſion was the ſealing up of the Covenant, did not only Circumciſe *Iſmael* his Son that was 13. years of Age, but all other Infants that were born in his houſe, among whom we reckon *Iſaac.*

Even ſo Faithful People which were Converted from Heathen Idolatry by the Preaching of the Goſpel, and Confeſſing the Faith, were Baptized; when they underſtood their Children to be counted among the People of GOD, and that Baptiſm was the Token of the People of God, they procured alſo their Children to be baptized. Therefore as it is written; Abraham *Circumciſed all the Male Children of his Houſe.* Semblably we read in the Acts and Writings of the Apoſtles, that after the Maſter of the Houſe was turned to the Faith, all the whole

whole House was baptized. And as concerning those which of old time were compelled to Confess their Faith before they received Baptism, which were called *Catechumeni*, they were such as with our Fore-Fathers came from the Gentiles to the Church, who being yet rude of Faith, they did instruct in the Principles of their Belief, and afterward they did Baptize them; but the same Ancient Fathers notwithstanding did Baptize the Children of Faithful Men, as I have already partly declared.

And because you do require a hasty answer of your Letter of one that is but a dull Writer, I am here enforced to cease particularly to go through your Letter in answering thereto, knowing that I have fully answered every part thereof, in that I have already written, although not in such order as it had been meet, and as I purposed. But forasmuch as I understand that you will be no Contentious Man, neither in this matter, neither in any other, contrary to the judgment of Christ's Primitive Church, which is the Body and fulness of Christ, I desire you in the intire love of him, or rather Christ desireth you by me (that your joy may be perfect, whereto you are now called) to submit your Judgment to that Church, and to be at Peace and Unity with the same; that the Coat of Christ which ought to be without Seam, but now alas, most miserably is torn in pieces by many dangerous Sects and Damnable Opinions, may appear by you in no part to have been rent, neither that any giddy head in these Dog-days, might take an ensample by you to dissent from Christ's true Church: I beseech thee Dear Brother in the Gospel, follow the steps of the Faith of the Glorious Martyrs in the Primitive Church, and of such as at this day follow the same; decline from them neither to the Right hand nor to

the Left. Then shall Death, be it never so bitter, be more sweeter than this Life; then shall Christ with all the Heavenly *Hierusalem* triumphantly imbrace your Spirit with unspeakable Gladness and Exaltation, who in this Earth was content to joyn your Spirit with their Spirits, according as it is commanded by the Word, That the Spirit of Prophets should be subject to the Prophets. One thing ask with *David* ere you depart, and require the same, that you may dwell with a full accord in his House, for there is Glory and Worship: And so with *Simeon* in the Temple embracing Christ, depart in Peace: To the which
1 Cor. 14. Peace Christ bring both you and me, and all our loving Brethren that love GOD in the Unity of Faith, by such ways as shall please him, to his Glory. Let the bitter Passion of Christ which he suffered for your sake, and the Horrible Torments which the Godly Martyrs of Christ have endured beforeus, and also the inestimable Reward of your Life to come, which is hidden yet a little while from you with Christ, strengthen, comfort, and encourage you to the end of that Glorious Race which you are in. *Amen.*

Your Yoke-fellow in Captivity for the Verity of Christ's Gospel, to live and die with you in the Unity of Faith,

John Philpot.

FINIS.

Books Printed for *FINCHAM GARDINER.*

A Continuation and Vindication of the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Unreasonableness of Separation, in Answer to Mr. *Baxter*, and Mr. *Lob*, &c.

Considerations of present use, considering the Danger Resulting from the Change of our Church-Government.

1. A Perswasive to Communion with the Church of *England.* 4o

2. A Resolution of some Cases of Conscience, which Respect Church-Communion. 4o

3. The Case of indifferent things, used in the Worship of God, Proposed and Stated by considering these Questions, &c. 4o

4. A Discourse about Edification. 4o

5. The Resolution of this Case of Conscience, *Whether the Church of* England's *Symbolizing so far as it doth with the Church of* Rome, *makes it Unlawful to hold Communion with the Church of* England? 4o

6. A Letter to *Anonimus*, in Answer to his Three Letters to Dr. *Sherlock* about Church-Communion. 4o

7. Certain Cases of Conscience resolved, concerning the Lawfulness of Joyning with Forms of Prayer in Publick Worship. In two Parts. 4o

8. The Case of Mixt Communion. Whether it be Lawful to Separate from a Church upon the Account of promiscuous Congregations and Mixt Communions?

9. An Answer to the Dissenters Objections against the Common-Prayers, and some other Parts of Divine Service Prescribed in the Liturgy of the Church of *England.* 4o

10. The Case of Kneeling at the Holy Sacrament, Stated and Resolved, &c. The first Part. 4o

11. Cer-

11. Certain Cases of Conscience, &c. The Second Part.

12. A Discourse of Profiting by Sermons, and going to hear where Men think they can profit most.

13. A serious Exhortation, with some Important Advices; Relating to the late Cases about Conformity, Recommended to the Present Dissenters from the Church of *England*.

14. An Argument for Union, &c.

15. The Case of Kneeling at the Sacrament. The Second Part.

16. Some Considerations about the Case of Scandals, or giving Offence to Weak Brethren.

1. A Discourse about the charge of Novelty upon the Reformed Church of *England*, made by the *Papists* asking of us the Question, Where was our Religion before *Luther?*

2. A Discourse about Tradition, shewing what is meant by it, and what Tradition is to be Received, and what Tradition is to be Rejected.

3. The Difference of the Case between the Separation of Protestants from the Church of *Rome*, and the Separation of Dissenters from the Church of *England*.

4. The Protestant Resolution of Faith, &c.

ERRATA.

PAge 8. Line 15. read Aſſhuerus. p. 10. l. 10. for as r. of. p. 19. l. 26: for Linnen r. of Linnen. p. 27. in Marg. l. 6. r. Theologicum. p. 28. l. 18. dele to. p. 31 l. 27. r. ſhews. fallaciouſly. p. 32. l. 16. for Inſtitutions r. an Inſtitution. p. 37. l. 3. r. difference. p. 45. l. 34. 35. r. the Order of Proſelyting Grown Perſons, and their Qualifications for Baptiſm. p. 46. l. 3. r. External. p. 49. in Marg. l. 16. r. quamdiù. p. 50. l. 17. r. require. in Marg. l. 13. r. Villicus. p. 5. in Marg. l. 9. for hanc, r. itane. p. 55. l. 17. for former, r. the former. p. 56. l. 12. r. univerſalis.